CMHC SCHL

Helping to house Canadians

Canada

Ca1
MH
91 H55
c.1

HOUSING NEEDS OF SINGLE MOTHERS AND THEIR CHILDREN

CMHC E[illegible] Program
Programme de [illegible] de la SCHL

By David L. Wiesenthal
Fredric Weizman, and
Susan Mockler

York University
March 1991

CMHC Project Manager: Janet Kiff-Macaluso

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement
Canadian Housing Information Centre
Centre canadien de documentation sur l'habitation

This project was carried out with the assistance of a grant from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation under the terms of the External Research Program. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not represent the official views of the Corporation.

92-04654/

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a contract from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The views expressed are solely those of the authors.

The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Nadia Colarusso, Vicki LaCrosse, Judy Riches and Paulette Senior. We also wish to thank all the mothers we spoke with for their patience, cooperation, and helpful suggestions.

Abstract

One hundred single mothers with children under ten years of age were recruited for an interview regarding their housing needs. Most mothers lived in metropolitan Toronto and were recruited from day care centres, newspaper notices, signs placed in public housing, referrals from mothers and public service radio announcements. It was seen that the longer the mother had been divorced or separated, the more likely she was to live in public housing. The better educated mother were more likely to live in private housing. Still, of those living in public housing, 19% had college degrees and 20% had attended college or university. Of those living in public housing, 75% were unemployed, compared to 51% of mothers in private housing. A higher proportion (74%) of mothers in public housing wanted employment compared to mothers living in private accommodations (26%). Canadian born mothers were more likely to live in private housing than nonCanadian born mothers, although both groups were more likely to live in public housing.

Those living in low rise buildings and townhouses had more bedrooms and rated their satisfaction with the dwelling higher than those in public housing. Mothers clearly expressed a preference for only certain types of services (health services and skills training). When mothers were asked to rank order the desirability of possible appliances, washing machines and clothes dryers were the most preferred items. Most single mothers expressed a preference for living in a mixed neighbourhood, rather than in a building or community with many single mothers. Mothers living in public housing expressed fear for their safety in terms of inadequate lighting, vandalism, and the physical security of the building, especially in the stairs and hallways These mothers were also concerned for their children's safety in terms of the availability of drugs and the perceived inadequacy of policing.

Executive Summary

One hundred single mothers recruited from day care centres, food banks, newspaper notices, personal referrals and notices placed in public housing to participate in an interview study of dealing with the housing needs of single mothers and children. These families were mostly living in Metropolitan Toronto and were comprised of single mothers living with children under ten years of age. It was seen that:

The longer the mother was divorced or separated, the more likely she lived in public housing and the less likely she lived in private housing. Forty percent of mothers in private housing lived in shared accommodations.

Even young mothers (aged 15-24 years) are as likely to live in public housing as private housing. Of those living in private housing, most are over 30 years old.

Canadian born mothers are more likely to live in private housing than nonCanadian born mothers. Both groups were more likely to live in public housing.

The better educated mother is more likely to live in private housing. Still, of those living in public housing, 19% had college degrees and 20% had attended college or university.

Of those living in public housing, 75% are unemployed, compared to 51% of mothers in private housing. A higher proportion of public housing mothers (74%) want to be employed than private housing mothers (26%)

Mothers clearly discriminated between potential services they were offerred and did not express a blanket preference for more services overall. Health services and evening courses in skills training were the most preferred.

Mothers in private housing wanted parenting skills course more than those in public housing (67% vs. 38%). Fully 57% of all mothers were interested in upgrading, with 49.4% expressing interest in nontraditional skills.

When mothers were asked to rank order the desirability of possible appliances, washing machines and clothes dryers were the most preferred item.

Services (marketing, dental, medical, and legal) were rated as accessible, with high satisfaction and convenience being expressed.

Most single mothers expressed a preference for living in a mixed neighbourhood, rather than in buildings or communities with many other single mothers.

Mothers living in low rise buildings and townhouses have more bedrooms and are more satisfied.

Although mothers in shared accommodation rated the bedrooms as adequate, when asked what changes would be desirable, they preferred more, but smaller bedrooms, possibly to enhance privacy.

Satisfaction with lighting levels was expressed in all areas of the dwelling with lower satisfaction expressed for lighting in parking areas.

Public housing mothers were more frightened in stairways and hallways than mothers in private housing. The two groups of mothers did not differ in fear in areas outside of the dwelling.

Public housing mothers indicated vandalism was a greater problem than private housing mothers. Mothers living in private housing were more likely to feel their building was more secure than those in public housing (51% vs. 24%). Public housing mothers were also less satisfied with policing than were private housing mothers.

Mothers in public housing were more likely to describe community problems with drugs and alcohol than did those in private housing (65% vs. 43%). Illicit drugs were described as more available in public housing (77% vs. 49%). The public housing mothers were also more concerned for their children having access to illicit drugs (84% vs. 57%).

SOMMAIRE DE LA PUBLICATION
«HOUSING NEEDS OF SINGLE MOTHERS AND THEIR CHILDREN»

On a demandé à une centaine de mères de famille monoparentale, recrutées par l'intermédiaire de garderies, de banques d'alimentation et au moyen de propositions de noms, d'avis passés dans les journaux ou placés dans les ensembles de logement public, de participer à une enquête portant sur les besoins de logement des mères de famille monoparentale et de leurs enfants. Ces familles monoparentales avec des enfants âgés de moins de dix ans, habitaient surtout le Toronto métropolitain. L'enquête a permis de constater ce qui suit:

Plus il s'est écoulé de temps depuis le divorce ou la séparation, plus grandes sont les probabilités pour la mère de famille monoparentale, qu'elle habite un logement public plutôt qu'un logement du secteur privé. Parmi celles qui habitaient un logement du secteur privé, 40 p. 100 d'entre elles partageaient leur logement.

Même les toutes jeunes mères, celles âgées entre 15 et 24 ans, peuvent autant se retrouver dans un logement public que dans un logement du secteur privé. Parmi celles qui habitent un logement du secteur privé, la plupart ont plus de 30 ans.

Il est plus probable que les mères natives du Canada habitent un logement du secteur privé que les mères d'origine étrangère. Les deux groupes cependant ont plus de probabilités de se retrouver dans des logements publics.

Les mères qui ont un niveau d'instruction plus élevé habitent plus souvent un logement du secteur privé. Cependant, parmi celles qui habitent un logement public, 19 p. 100 des femmes avaient un diplôme collégial et 20 p. 100 avaient suivi des cours de niveau collégial ou universitaire.

75 p. 100 des mères qui habitent dans un logement public n'ont pas d'emploi, comparativement à 51 p. 100 de celles qui habitent un logement du secteur privé. Une plus forte proportion de mères habitant dans des logements du secteur public (74 p. 100) veulent avoir un emploi, comparativement à 26 p. 100 chez les femmes habitant un logement du secteur privé.

Les femmes savaient très bien choisir les services qu'elles voulaient parmi ceux qui étaient offerts et elles n'ont pas, en général, exprimé le désir d'avoir accès à d'autres services. La préférence est allée aux services reliés à la santé et aux cours de formation donnés le soir.

Les mères habitant un logement du secteur privé ont exprimé, dans une plus forte proportion que celles habitant dans un logement public (67 p. 100 par rapport à 38 p. 100), le désir d'acquérir des compétences parentales. 57 p. 100 de toutes les mères étaient intéressées à améliorer leurs compétences et leur formation, tandis que 49,4 p. 100 étaient intéressées à être formées dans des domaines non traditionnels.

Lorsqu'on a demandé aux mères d'indiquer, par ordre de priorité, les appareils ménagers qu'elles aimeraient avoir, leur préférence est allée aux laveuses et aux sécheuses.

L'accès aux services offerts (marketing, soins dentaires et médicaux, et conseils juridiques) a obtenu une cote favorable; les répondantes les ont trouvés commodes et ont exprimé un fort degré de satisfaction.

La plupart des mères de famille monoparentale ont indiqué qu'elles préféraient vivre dans un quartier diversifié, plutôt que dans un immeuble ou un quartier abritant plusieurs autres familles de même genre.

Les mères qui habitent des immeubles de faible hauteur ou des maisons en rangée ont des logements comptant plus de chambres à coucher et sont plus satisfaites.

Bien que les mères qui partageaient leur logement aient indiqué que les chambres à coucher étaient adéquates, lorsqu'on leur a demandé quels changements elles aimeraient voir, elles ont indiqué qu'elles préféreraient avoir plus de chambres, mais de dimensions plus petites, sans doute pour avoir plus d'intimité.

Les répondantes étaient satisfaites du niveau d'éclairage dans les logements, mais elles l'étaient moins pour l'éclairage dans les zones de stationnement.

Les mères habitant dans un logement du secteur public se sentaient moins en sécurité dans les escaliers et les corridors, que les mères habitant dans un logement du secteur privé. Pour les autres endroits à l'extérieur, il n'y a pas eu de différence entre les deux groupes.

Plus que les mères qui habitent un logement du secteur privé, celles qui habitent un logement public ont indiqué que le vandalisme était davantage un problème. Les mères habitant un logement du secteur privé avaient plus de chances de se sentir en sécurité dans le bâtiment où elles logeaient, que celles qui habitent dans un logement public (51 p. 100 par rapport à 24 p. 100). De plus, ces dernières sont moins satisfaites des services de police que les autres.

Les mères habitant un logement public étaient plus nombreuses (65 p. 100 par rapport à 43 p. 100) à signaler des problèmes communautaires reliés à la drogue et à l'alcool, que celles qui habitent un logement du secteur privé. On a indiqué que les drogues illégales sont plus faciles à obtenir dans les logements publics (77 p. 100 par rapport à 49 p. 100). Les mères habitant un logement public étaient également plus inquiètes pour leurs enfants devant cette facilité d'accès (84 p. 100 par rapport à 57 p. 100).

CMHC SCHL

Helping to house Canadians
Question habitation. comptez sur nous

National Office
700 Montreal Road
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0P7

Bureau National
700 chemin Montréal
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0P7

Puisqu'on prévoit une demande restreinte pour ce document de recherche, seul le sommaire a été traduit.

La SCHL fera traduire le document si la demande le justifie.

Pour nous aider à déterminer si la demande justifie que ce rapport soit traduit en français, veuillez remplir la partie ci-dessous et la retourner à l'adresse suivante :

Le Centre canadien de documentation sur l'habitation
La Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement
700, chemin de Montréal, bureau C1-200
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0P7

TITRE DU RAPPORT: ______________________________

____

Je préférerais avoir ce rapport en français.

NOM ______________________________

ADRESSE ______________________________
rue app.

----
ville province code postal

No de téléphone ( ) ____________

1946 SCHL 45 CMHC 1991

Characteristics of Single Parents

Canada has experienced a dramatic increase in the percentage of single-parent families in between 1966 and 1986, the number of one-parent families increased by 130%. This family form now accounts for 13% of all families in Canada, with 14% of children under 25 being raised in such families. Recent statistics indicate that 82% of single parents are women. This number increases to 94% when looking at single parents under the age of 24. In 1986, over half of all single parents were separated or divorced, 28% were widowed, and the remaining 15% had never married (M.Moore, 1987).

Single female parents are more likely to have entered their first union at a younger age than married women. This difference is particularly noticeable for women in the 20-24 age group, where 80% of single mothers enter a marital or common-law relationship before the age of 19 compared to 53% of wives (Pool & M. Moore, 1986). Single mothers also tend to begin childbearing at an earlier age than wives. Of all lone female parents, 26% had a child before they were 20, whereas only 20% of wives had had a child by that time (M. Moore, 1987). The younger the age at which single mothers enter their first union and have their first child, the more likely it is that they will lack the education, skills, or training necessary to secure adequate employment.

While 31% of wives had some formal education at the post-secondary level, this was true for only 24% of single mothers. Despite this fact, a higher percentage of single mothers than wives were in the labour market (M. Moore, 1987). Single parents are particularly disadvantaged in terms of income. If single status is the result of divorce, separation, or the death of a spouse, there is most often a substantial loss of income. In 1980, 47% of single mothers had a total annual income of less than $10,000 (Statistics Canada, 1984). More recent data show that, in 1985, the average income of female lone parents was $20,000 compared to almost $44,000 for two-parent households (Moore, 1987). For the single mother, government assistance makes up 24% of her income, whereas only seven percent of the income of two-parent families derives from this source. The most telling statistic, however, is that 60% of all female-headed one-parent families live below the poverty line (as defined by Statistics Canada). Only 11% of two-parent families are classified as living below the poverty line (M. Moore, 1987).

These differences in income show up in a number of tangible ways that affect everday life. Thus lone female-parent households are less likely than two-parent households to own labour saving appliances such as freezers, washing machines, clothes dryers, dishwashers, and microwave ovens. They are also less likely to have safety devices, such as smoke detectors and fire extinguishers, in their homes. While 86% of two-parent households own a car, this is true for only 55% of female-headed one-parent families (M. Moore, 1987).

While all of these material disadvantages are important, they constitute only some of the more obvious problems faced by single mothers. More fundamental are the barriers which prevent single-mothers from overcoming these disadvantages. These include the excessive demands which are made on their time and energy, and the lack of support provided them to help meet these demands. Both of these problems in turn add to the problems single mothers have in obtaining the adequate educational and occupational skills that would help them move out of the poverty status in which many of them find themselves.

Child Care

The provision of child care and supervision is a difficult problem even in two-parent families where both parents work, the situation in which over half of all Canadian families now find themselves (Parliamentary Special Committee on Child Care, 1987). It is even more of a problem in single-parent families, however, where one, often low income must cover the cost of child care in addition to housing costs, groceries, transportation, and other living costs. Whenever a single mother leaves her residence, whether she is going to work, school, or simply to run an errand, she must first take into consideration what arrangements need to be made for the care of her children while she is out. Hence it is not surprising that Li (1978) found that daycare placement provided the dominant type of care for 29% of the single mothers in her sample compared to only 9% of the two-parent families.

Turner and Smith (1983) discovered that single parents have special daycare needs including support services and more daycare options. Options such as part-time care, drop-in care, and transportation assistance were suggested. The authors also emphasized the need for daycare to be affordable and accessible to single mothers.

A longitudinal study by Campbell, Breitmayer, and Ramey (1986) examined the effects of providing free educational daycare to single teenage mothers. Seventy-one percent of the mothers in the daycare group were rated as more successful compared to 47% of those in the no daycare group. Forty-six percent of the teenagers in the daycare group had attained some post-high school education, whereas only 13% of the control group had done so. The daycare group was also significantly more likely than the control group to become self-supporting. These data indicate that the provision of daycare for young single mothers could be a crucial factor in improving the quality of life for single-parent families.

Similar findings have also been reported in Ontario. Weizmann, Friendly and Gonda (1984) recently carried out an evaluation study of a day-care centre specifically oriented to the special needs of adolescent single-mothers and their children, which was located in a Toronto public school (The Montrose Project). Also included in their study were two other day-centres geared to this population. Weizmann et. al (1984) reported that 83% of a sample of 42 adolescent mothers who had used these centres were either continuing their education or intending to do so at the start of the next school term. (The survey was carried out during the summer.) Many of the mothers had completed high school and were enrolled in community college. By contrast, only 43% of a comparison group of adolescent mothers who were rearing their children at home were continuing their education or had any plans to do so. It is also worth mentioning that the authors were only able to locate 11 adolescent mothers who were using regular Metro Toronto day-care centres, despite the fact that they were eligible for financial subsidies to enable them to do so. This reinforces Turner and Smith's (1983) general conclusion that single-mothers have special day-care needs which, if unmet, may constitute an effective barrier to their use of day-care.

The Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues (1987) recently completed a study of sole-support mothers across Canada. The Council recommended to the Ontario government that hospitals, community centers, educational facilities, and businesses should be given financial incentives to encourage the provision of child care for irregular hours and emergency situations. In addition, it was suggested that the government should fund child care services for those mothers attending support groups. Child care allowances were recommended for single mothers pursuing their education or looking for employment.

Health and Well-Being of Single Parents

McLanahan (1985) conducted a study based on data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, which is a representative sample of the American population. McLanahan used a subsample of 2,000 of these families for her study. Single mothers were compared with married fathers in the area of psychological well-being, chronic strain, and life events. Several findings emerged from the study. McLanahan found that 'single mothers experience a substantial decline (about 11%) in well-being over a one-year period' (McLanahan, 1985, p. 264). The study also discovered that the living conditions of single mothers were at least partly to blame for this decline. Forty per cent of the decline in well-being among single mothers was attributed to chronic strain and 33% was due to low income. Single mothers were found to have experienced more of both stressful life events and chronic strain than married parents, but were not found to be more vulnerable to this stress than the married parents. In other words, the fact that single parents have a lower level of psychological well-being than married parents does not indicate that single parents possess an inherent vulnerability to stress which leads to both their single status and their lower level of well-being. Rather, single mothers face a greater amount of stressful life events and more chronic strain as a result of their marital status. In addition to this, single mothers often have less resources with which to cope with this stress. Further support for these data come from Sanik and Maudlin (1986) who examined differences in time use between one and two parent households. The study compared employed and non-employed mothers from both family types to determine the amount of time spent by each in various areas of daily activities. Single employed mothers were found to have the least amount of time available for child care, household tasks, personal care and volunteer work.

Burden (1986) compared the well-being of single and married employees, both parents and non-parents. Of all groups, single female parents were at the highest risk for high levels of stress and depression. The main contributing factor to this low level of emotional well-being was the role strain that these mothers experienced from the combination of job and family responsibilities. Single parent status by itself did not appear to be a significant factor. Despite having high levels of role strain and low levels of support, single mothers did not demonstrate any difference from other workers in their job performance and showed a higher level of job satisfaction than other marital and parental categories.

These three studies all demonstrate the excessive levels of stress and low levels of emotional and psychological well-being among single mothers. The following studies indicate that these disadvantages also exist for the children of single parents.

Children of Single Parents

The Ontario Child Health Study (OCHS) was carried out on a sample of 3,294 children between the ages of 4 and 16 across Ontario. The study measured the prevalence of the following four psychological disorders: neurosis, somatization, conduct disorder, and hyperactivity. Children from single-parent families were more than twice as likely to have been seen by a social or mental health service than were children from two-parent families' (Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1986, p. 10). This does not necessarily result from the family status itself, but may be the due to a combination of factors often associated with single parents such as low income or living in subsidized housing. When various social and demographic variables were examined, strong associations were seen between some of the variables and prevalence of disorder. For example, children with a psychological impairment were 2.6 times as likely to live in subsidized housing than were children without a disorder. Children from welfare families were 2.8 times more likely to have psychological and learning disorders than children from non-welfare families. Some of the other factors having a statistically significant relationship with the prevalence of psychological disorder were: single parenthood, low income, mother's low level of education, overcrowded housing and urban residence.

Offord and Boyle (1986) conducted a study based on the data from the OCHS to determine the mental health of children from families who received welfare. More than two-thirds of the children from welfare families came from single-parent households. On all measures, welfare children were significantly disadvantaged in comparison to their non-welfare counterparts. Compared to non-welfare children, the welfare children had more than twice the rate of psychiatric disorder, poor school performance, more smoking behaviour, greater than one-and-a-half times the frequency of both chronic health problems and lowered participation in extracurricular activities (p. 11). The study also revealed that the relationship between welfare status and psychiatric disorders or poor school performance was not affected by family status. Low income was found to account for only some of the relationship between welfare status and these two measures. These results suggest that there are factors besides income level which are associated with welfare children and which put them at a disadvantage compared to non-welfare children.

Mueller and Cooper (1986) compared children from traditional two-parent families to children from one-parent families on how well they fared as young adults. They discovered that children from one-parent families do not do as well as their counterparts in two-parent families in areas of education, occupation, and economic achievement. These results existed even when the experiment was controlled for economic conditions.

This research indicates that the situation of the single-parent family can have deleterious effects on the children of single parents and therefore improving the situation of single parents should have a positive effect on their offspring. The following section deals with various types of support which can be offered to single parents and the effectiveness of providing these services.

Support Services for Single-Parent Families

Unger and Wandersman (1985) assessed the impact of social intervention on various characteristics of the single adolescent mother and her child. Seventy young single mothers from a rural area in Columbia, South Carolina were visited by a Resource Mother once a month during the time they were pregnant and for one year following the birth. The Resource Mothers provided "information concerning infant development and parenting skills, emotional support and encouragement, and help in acquiring health care, social services, and support resources" (Unger & Wandersman, 1985 p. 31). This help included providing transportation assistance to medical services. A group of 17 similar mothers served as a control group. This group was contacted by a Resource Mother once every three months for the same period of time and were given limited referrals and emotional support when necessary. A significantly higher percentage of the mothers who had not received active intervention gave birth to babies with a low birth weight than those who had received intervention. The visited mothers were also more favorably rated in knowledge about babies, satisfaction with mothering, and attitudes towards their babies. These mothers were more likely than those in the control group to seek medical care and to remain in school.

Denton and Davis (1987) conducted a study on patterns of support among tenants of subsidized housing in various municipalities in Ontario. The study was comprised of interviews with tenants, as well as a survey of service providers and agencies. More than two-thirds of the tenants in the study headed single-parent households. The results of the tenant survey revealed that almost 90% of the tenants reported having difficulty with at least one activity of daily living, while the average number of difficulties was 3.8. Seventy percent of the tenant respondents reported having problems with budgeting and making ends meet. Service providers saw the main problems of tenants to be unemployment, inadequate skills to gain employment, and lack of motivation to work. An important finding of the study in terms of housing for single parents was that "most of the service providers felt that an on-site multi-service facility would improve service delivery to public housing tenants in their community" (Denton & Davis, 1987, p. 134). This illustrates the relationship between housing design and use of social services by the tenants. By providing services and support within the housing complex, tenants will be better able to make use of the services.

Housing and Single Parents

The high percentage of one-parent families living below the poverty line makes it particularly difficult for single mothers to find adequate, affordable housing. This is demonstrated by the fact that only 30% of female-headed single-parent families live in single detached homes compared to 66% of two-parent families. In addition, 72% of single mothers rent rather than own while only 27% of two-parent families are renters (M. Moore, 1987).

The percentage of single mothers living in public housing is considerably higher than the total percentage of single mothers living in the city of Toronto. A recent article by McMillan (1987) examined the characteristics of the residents of four Toronto area public housing developments in comparison to the general population of Toronto. In all four cases, the percentage of single parents in public housing developments was at least double the rate of 15% for the city of Toronto.

In Regent Park, Toronto's first public housing development, single-parent families accounted for 69% of the tenants.

The report of the Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues found that the conditions of public housing complexes were often less than adequate. The Council argued that alternative non-subsidized housing would require mothers to spend 40% to 60% of their income on housing.

Most of the literature dealing with housing and single parents refers to the need to provide more than just shelter. The idea of service-oriented housing has already become popular in several European countries such as Sweden and the Netherlands (Leavitt, 1984; France, 1985). In North American, however, the response to the needs of non-traditional households has been slower. Studies conducted more than 15 years age (Guyatt, 1971; Canadian Council on Social Development, 1971) recognized the need for various types of support services to be made available to single parents in Canada. A few years after these studies were completed, several government programs were introduced in Canada which essentially dispersed and integrated the single-parent population throughout the community (Klodawsky & Spector, 1986). These programs, however, ignored the fact that the specific needs of single parents differ from those of traditional families. More recently, several authors have looked at ways in which the needs of single parents can be accommodated through the built environment.

Klodawsky and Spector (1986) argue that child care and accessibility are key issues which need to be addressed when designing housing for single mothers. "Housing located near shopping, child care, and job opportunities reduces the accessibility problems of these families" (Klodawsky & Spector, 1986, p. 8). The authors argue that single-parent families are faced to choose between costly, inaccessible suburban accommodation, or small urban apartments which are unsuitable for children. They suggest, therefore, that Canadian housing policies should be revised to accommodate the needs of non-traditional households.

Elsewhere, Klodawsky and Spector (1985) describe several Canadian housing projects especially designed for single parents. They identify three common environmental factors which should be considered: ". . . highly efficient and appropriately designed private units; a location central to a variety of support services and facilities; and opportunities for social interaction and support in the immediate community" (Klodawsky & Spector, 1985, p. 12). These authors suggest that co-operative housing increases the mothers' feeling of control over the environment and that the mother benefits from living with others who share the same needs and interests.

A design described by Leavitt (1984) follows similar principles, emphasizing a balance of privacy and sharing within one housing project. The design makes use of flexible space to allow for changing needs throughout a family's life cycle. Services which Leavitt feels are important for single mothers include, "assistance with food preparation, overcoming adult isolation, reducing transportation costs, and securing well-paying jobs" (p. 19). Leavitt also observed that single parents do not want their single-parent status to be obvious. Housing which blends into the neighbourhood would be beneficial in reducing any possible stigmatization.

Soper (1980) describes the design of a proposed housing project for Ottawa (LeBreton Flats) which involved women in its planning and analyzed the needs of single parents. This design was similar to the other projects in that it emphasized privacy balanced with communal living and flexible space to allow for changing lifestyles. Another aspect it emphasized was a child-oriented atmosphere. Elderly and single persons would also live within the complex and interaction would be encouraged through shared entrances and facilities. Laundry facilities, daycare, and eating areas would be centrally located within the housing project and could provide employment for the residents. In other words, the design was intended to provide an environment which would reduce the disadvantages faced by single-parent families as much as possible.

Several of the recommendations in the report by The Ontario Advisory Council on the Status of Women refer to ways in which housing for single parents should be designed to make their lives easier. They suggest that subsidized units should be built in private apartment buildings to avoid ghettoizing. It was also recommended that co-op child care centers and laundry facilities be established within public housing complexes. The Council felt that community relations workers should be given lighter case loads so that they would have more time to spend with tenants and also so they would be able to facilitate the development of self-help groups, maintenance programs run by the tenants, and any other necessary programs. In addition, the Council recommended that Ontario Housing Policies be reviewed and that tenants be involved in this process.

Environment and Behaviour

Recently, considerable interest in the relationship between the child's environment and developmental issues has been seen (Heft & Wohlwill, 1987; Weinstein & David, 1987). A number of writers have dealt with the issue of daycare settings on child behaviour (Johnson, 1987; G. T. Moore, 1987; Olds, 1987; Prescott, 1987). Wachs (1987) has presented a model of four potential relationships between the physical and social environments in terms of their relevance to child development. The relevance of the physical setting depends upon the type of environmental action pattern operating.

Saegert (1982) examined the relationship between residential density and the well-being of low-income children. Interviews with 257 children living in public housing projects in New York City provided the data for the study. Reading achievement scores and teachers' ratings of the children's behaviour were also used. The teachers' evaluations of the children showed that in all three areas--hostility, anxiety, and hyperactivity, children from high-density apartments had higher scores than those from low-density apartments. Higher apartment density was also found to be related to lower scores on vocabulary and reading comprehension tests. The study also noted that there was a positive correlation between living in high-rise buildings and negative social behaviour. Vandalism was more common in high-rise buildings and children in these buildings were less likely to feel guilty about vandalism. Newman (1972) also obtained a relationship between highrise housing and vandalism.

Rationale for the Present Study

With few exceptions, the research on single parents and their housing needs consists of the suggestions of architects, designers, and feminists, based on their perceptions of what single mothers need. These suggestions are often made without the experience of having lived with the day-to-day trials and tribulations of being a single parent. If time and money are to be spent to create housing designed for the single-parent family, then it is important that these designs are based on what single parents *themselves* perceive to be their needs, rather than relying on designs which ultimately may not meet the needs of these families.

Sommer offers several explanations for the reluctance of professionals to pay attention to the values and needs of occupants in his writings (1972; 1974). One of these explanations is that the present reward system in the field of architecture encourages aesthetic and technical criteria and discourages feelings of social responsibility. Aesthetic and technical criteria should still be used, but user satisfaction would also be a necessary criterion.

Sommer points out that it is easier for policy-makers to assume that everyone has similar needs and tastes, than to try to accommodate the varied needs of different types of users. In the case of single mothers, then, it is easier to design housing for the dominant family form and assume that it will suit the needs of all family types.

A third reason which Sommer offers to explain the reluctance to pay attention to the needs of the users, has to do with attitudes. Sommer argues that architects and designers often employ a denigrating we/they dichotomy when designing public housing. The philosophy is that "We know what's best for them and they don't" (Sommer, 1974, p.2). According to Sommer, the underlying ideology of this belief represents a sort of "neobehaviourism". People feel that providing decent housing for low-income families would in some way be rewarding them for their poverty. In other words, if we allow the poor to live comfortably, they will have no motivation to work their way out of poverty. Poor housing makes an already stressful situation even worse. "Poor housing lowers the self-esteem of the tenant and helps to convince him[her] how little society cares about his[her] plight" (Sommer, 1974, p. 9). It only seems logical that providing a positive environment will encourage positive behaviour.

Zeisel (1981) points out that designers and architects can not be expected to be behavioural scientists, just as behavioural scientists can not be expected to be designers. It is for this reason that the two fields must work together to create a built environment which will suit the needs of tenants. Zeisel suggests that a multi-method approach to research is necessary to fully understand the relationship between environment and behaviour.

Since little is known how single mothers perceive their housing environment, it is important that this aspect of the issue be examined. At the very least, the aspects of the housing situation which are presently a hindrance should be removed. At best, housing should be used to lessen the heavy burden already faced by single mothers.

All of this data provides a striking indication of how family-status may interact with type of housing and income to generate a number of social problems. While this situation, constitutes a burden on social, educational, and health agencies, at best, it is a problem of individual parents struggling to rear their children under very difficult circumstances, and it is at this level that housing may have a role to play.

The concept of the "prosthetic environment," was introduced by Lindsley (1966), to suggest that many people who have problems in coping with the environment." To date, this idea has mainly been employed to make environments and buildings more accessible to the physically disabled. This idea has not been employed, however, to help design environments for other groups, for whom life might be easier, more productive and healthier if their special environmental needs were taken into account.

Zeisel's work on architectural design demonstrates how user needs can be incorporated in the design of housing. In a public housing development in Boston, it was found that Black Americans and Puerto Rican immigrants had different cultural values that affected how space was perceived and utilized. By utilizing this data, Zeisel was able to incorporate these differences into his designs.

Just as different cultural groups may have different needs and values regarding the design and utilization of space, so low-income families headed by single mothers may also have different needs. Hence, it would be valuable to investigate whether these mothers regard their environments as either helpful or harmful in terms of their needs, roles and values as parents. The question is one of determining how various features of the public housing currently occupied by the single parents, largely female, contribute to their ability to rear and educate their children competently, and to further their own educational and occupational goals.

Specifically, the aim of the research would be develop interview and questionnaire measures designed to examine how the single mother perceives her living quarters, in terms of its effect on her ability to rear her family and improve their quality of life. What design features might make the job of parenting easier; i.e. would a day-care facility in the building be easier to use than a neighbourhood centre? Would evening extension courses held in a community room of a housing complex increase involvement in education and thus aid social advancement? Should apartments feature individual washing and clothes drying appliances to make their use more convenient, or might mothers enjoy the social contact involved in using communal laundry rooms? To what extent do current housing provisions increase parental stresses? How serious are problems of poor maintenance, how do they affect a family's quality of life, and how can the problem of adequate maintenance be solved in a way that does not make too many demands on a mother who already has many demands made upon her? Do feelings of control and autonomy differ for mothers in public and non-public housing, and if so, what difference does that make? What are the effects of living in an environment composed mainly of single-parent families as opposed to a more heterogeneous environment? How do housing needs change over time as children grow up and parents age? What effect does location, accessibility and the adequacy of transportation have? We feel that it would be most valuable to obtain answers to these and other questions from the standpoint of the parent who is the ultimate user of public and assisted housing.

SUBJECTS

One hundred single mothers from the Metropolitan Toronto area were recruited through public service radio and newspaper advertisements, letters provided to daycare settings, social service and community agencies providing services to single parents, food banks, posters in public housing developments and personal referrals. All written materials and radio broadcasts were in English. Table 1 describes the proportion of single mothers recruited by each method. Ninety-five of the mothers resided in urban Toronto, while five of the mothers lived in smaller suburban communities outside the Metropolitan Toronto district; three mothers were from Oakville, two were from Brampton.

No family was eligible for the study if an unrelated male partner lived in the home on a regular basis. Single mothers were considered for participation only if at least one child ten years of age or younger resided in the home.

With respect to marital status, 50% of the single mothers were never married, while the remaining half of the sample consisted of women separated from a common-law or marital relationship (23%), divorced (24%) or widowed (3%) women. In the Statistics Canada 1984 Family History Survey of 14,004 married women, men and single-parent male and female headed families (Pool & Moore, 1986), 13% of the single mothers were never married, 16% were widowed and 71% were either separated (marital or common-law) or divorced. In comparison, the present sample had a larger proportion of never married women.

Fifty-four percent of the single mothers were thirty years of age or older, 27% were 25 to 29 years of age, 15% were 20 to 25 years of age and 4% were between 15 and 19 years of age. In Pool and Moore's (1986) sample, 12% of the lone mothers were 18 to 24 years of age, 15% were 25 to 29 years old and seventy-three percent were thirty years of age or older. The single mothers interviewed for this study was younger than that reported in a previous larger-scale Canadian study. The fact of having younger single mothers in our study may also account for the finding that more of these mothers were never married than in previous research (Pool & Moore, 1986).

Of the total sample of mother-led families, 47% consisted of one child, 34% of two children and 19% were comprised of three children or more. Considered together, the 100 single mothers in the study resided with 181 children (95 male, 86 female), the median age of the children being 5 years and the modal age 4 years.

Over two-thirds of the mothers in the sample (71%) were born in Canada while the remaining 29% were born outside the country. As table 2 suggests, the largest proportion (11%) of women born outside Canada were of West Indian descent. The majority of mothers born outside the country (72%, n=21) had resided in Canada for more than ten years.

With respect to maternal educational background, 61% of the mothers were high school graduates, 24% had attended college or university and 22% had received an university degree or comparable certification. This level of educational background is fairly consistent with findings reported in previous research consisting of both single mother and married mother samples. For example, in Pool and Moore's (1986) study, of the lone mothers surveyed 57% had some high school education and 24% had received some post-secondary education; for the married mothers in their study, 53% had some high school education, while 31% had attended a post-secondary educational facility (Pool & Moore, 1987).

In terms of employment status, 18% of the mothers were employed full-time, 15% were working on a part-time basis while 67% did not work outside the home. Of those single mothers employed outside the home 39% (n=13) were engaged in community or interpersonal service occupations, 24% (n=8) worked in semi-professional/professional/managerial capacities, 21% (n=7) were employed in clerical/administrative roles and 15% (n=5) worked in the service sector. This sample of single mothers reported much lower employment rates compared to other Canadian samples; for example, in Pool & Moore (1986) 61% of lone female parents and 57% of married mothers reported participation in the labour force. These lower employment levels were undoubtedly related to the purposeful attempt to sample a large proportion of low-income mothers living in subsidized housing for the present study.

In general, the family income levels of this single mother sample were low. Forty percent of the mothers reported annual family income levels of $10,000 or less; 39% indicated their family income was between $10,001 and $15,000 per year, while the remaining 21% reported family incomes of $15,001 or more annually. Considering family income level together with the number of persons residing in the household, 84% of these female headed single-parent families had annual incomes below the poverty line as defined by Statistics Canada (1989). Using data from the 1984 Statistics Canada Family History Survey, Moore (1987) reported that average income reported by single mother families was just over $20,000 compared to almost $44,000 for husband/wife families. Sixty percent of those single mother families had incomes below the low income cut offs defined by Statistics Canada (Moore, 1987). It is evident that the present sample of single mothers had much lower family incomes than would be expected even considering an exclusively single mother Canadian sample. This was probably related to the sampling goal of including a large proportion of low-income single mothers living in subsidized housing.

Almost three-quarters (72%) of the single mothers participating in the study received Family Benefits, while a further 11% were the recipients of other forms of government assistance including general welfare, unemployment insurance, disability pensions, daycare subsidies and student loans and grants. Sixty-five percent of the families lived in government subsidized housing.

Mothers who responded to the advertisements, letters or personal referrals of others were telephoned by a female graduate research assistant. Mothers were initially screened for age of child and single parent status. Mothers were informed that the study was concerned with housing, child care arrangements and parenting stress in single mother families. The procedure of the study was briefly described including the amount of payment ($15.00) and the anticipated length of the interview (90 minutes). Mothers were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and asked if they had any questions at this time. If they still wished to participate, the time and date of the interview was arranged by telephone. Of the 108 mothers contacted, 2 were unable to participate as they failed to meet the eligibility criteria of the study and 6 of the mothers did not wish to participate once the nature of the study was fully explained to them.

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics

Although the preceding discussion described the demographic characteristics of the single mother sample as a whole, it was also of interest to further examine whether any demographic variables significantly differentiated mothers living in public housing from those mothers living in private accommodation.

Table 3 presents marital status, time since separated/divorced/widowed, maternal age, maternal educational level and country of birth as a function of whether mothers lived in public or private housing. As this table demonstrates, when mothers living in public and private housing were compared, they did not significantly differ along any of these variables.

In view of the significant correlation between the number of children and number of bedrooms items (r=.55, p< .01), a one-way multivariate analysis of variance procedure (MANOVA) was conducted to compare the number of children and number of bedrooms (the latter result is discussed below) of mothers living in private and public housing. Mothers living in subsidized housing reported a mean number of 2.04 children (n=65, $s.d.$=0.99) living with them, while mothers living in private housing reported a mean number of 1.29 children (n=35, $s.d.$=0.52) living at home with them. This difference was statistically reliable (Multivariate F(2,97)=9.37, p<.001; Univariate F(1,98)=17.91, p< .001).

Table 4 compares current employment status and desired employment status for mothers living in public and private housing. With respect to current employment status, 31% (*n*=11) of mothers living in private housing reported being employed on a full-time basis compared to only 11% (*n*=7) of mothers residing in subsidized housing. A similar proportion of mothers living in private and public housing reported working outside the home on a part-time basis (17% and 14% respectively), while three quarters (75%, *n*=49) of mothers residing in public housing did not participate in the labour force on either a full- or part-time basis, compared to just over one-half of the mothers (51%, *n*=18) living in private accommodation. This difference in employment status was statistically significant (chi^2= 7.51, *p*<.02).

Mothers who did not report working outside the home were further asked whether they would prefer to be employed part-time, full-time or not at all at the present time. Thirty-three percent (*n*=16) of mothers living in subsidized housing indicated their desire to participate in the work force on a full-time basis compared to only 18% (*n*=3) of mothers residing in private accommodation. Forty-six percent (*n*=22) of mothers living in public housing expressed the desire to be employed on a part-time basis, while 29% (*n*=5) of mothers living in private housing endorsed this option. Over one-half of the mothers (53%, *n*=9) living in private housing indicated a preference for not being employed outside the home on either a full- or part-time basis at the present time compared to only 21% (*n*=10) of mothers living in subsidized housing. These response differences between mothers living in public and private housing were statistically reliable (chi^2= 6.30, *p*<.05).

Consistent with these differences in employment status between mothers living in public and private housing, mothers in these residential groups were also found to differ in terms of government assistance received and family income levels. Specifically, 84% (*n*=54) of mothers living in subsidized housing reported receiving family benefits compared to 51% (*n*=18) of mothers living in private housing. Twenty-six percent (*n*=9) of mothers living in private accommodation reported receiving government assistance other than family benefits including general welfare, daycare subsidies, disability pensions, and student loans or grants, while only 6.3% (*n*=4) of mothers living in subsidized housing reported government assistance from these other sources. Twenty-three percent (n=8) of mothers residing in private housing indicated that they received no government assistance while this was true for only 9% (*n*=6) of those living in public housing. Mothers living in public housing appeared to rely on family benefits, while in comparison mothers living in private housing seemed to rely more on other forms of government assistance or none at all. These differences were statistically significant (chi^2= 12.81, *p*<.002).

With respect to family income levels, 53% (*n*=34) of mothers living in private housing reported annual income levels of $10,000 or less compared to only 17% (*n*=6) of mothers residing in public accommodation. Fifty-one percent (*n*=18) of mothers living in private housing reported income levels of $10,001 to $15,000, while only 32% (*n*=21) of mothers living in subsidized housing reported income levels in this range. Thirty-one percent (*n*=11) of mothers living in private housing indicated that their annual family income was in excess of $15,000, while this was true for only 15% (*n*=10) of mothers living in public housing. This response pattern was significantly different for mothers living in public and private housing (chi^2= 11.95,*p*<.003) and seems to suggest that consistent with the greater tendency for mothers living in private housing to be employed full-time and rely less on government assistance, they also tend to have larger annual income levels than do mothers living in public housing.

General Housing Variables

Mothers were asked to indicate whether or not they had difficulty finding a place to live. Seventy-one percent (*n*=46) of the mothers living in subsidized housing and 63% (*n*=22) of mothers living in private housing replied that they had encountered difficulty when seeking residential accommodation. This difference was not significant when mothers in private and public housing were compared (chi^2= 0.65, *p*>.05).

Sixty percent (n=21) of mothers living in private housing and fifty-seven percent (n=37) of mothers residing in public housing agreed that they had experienced discrimination when seeking housing. The remainder (3% (*n*=2) of the mothers living in public housing and 14% (*n*=5) of the mothers living in private housing) replied that they didn't know whether or not they had experienced discrimination or that they had not (40% (*n*=26) of those living in public housing; 26% of those living in private accommodation. These different patterns of response were not significantly different for women living in either housing group (chi^2= 5.45, *p*>.05). When asked to specify in what respects they had felt discriminated against, mothers suggested that merely the factor of being a single mother with a child or children and not a two-parent "family" made it difficult for them to obtain housing. Another reason cited was being the recipient of family benefits. Mothers living in subsidized housing tended to respond that public housing did not discriminate against them and it was only when they had attempted to secure housing on the private market that they encountered difficulty. Some mothers further suggested that having resided in public housing would be detrimental in the future as private market landlords would discriminate against them.

Table 5 compares mothers living in subsidized housing to those living in private housing as a function of the type of housing in which they live (i.e., apartment in lowrise building--four floors or less; apartment in highrise building--greater than four floors; townhouse; shared accommodation or other including single family dwelling, apartment in single family dwelling or rooms). As Table 5 suggests mothers living in subsidized housing tended to live in lowrise, highrise buildings or townhouses while mothers interviewed living in private accommodation tended to live in shared accommodation or other housing types ($chi^2 = 41.12$, $p < .0001$). In view of this significant difference in housing type between mothers living in subsidized and private housing, for further analyses where type of housing was the independent variable of interest this was examined only for those mothers living in subsidized housing. In addition, because only three of the mothers living in public housing were living in housing types other than lowrise, highrise or townhouse (see Table 5), the responses of these mothers were deleted in subsequent analyses where type of housing was the independent variable.

Mothers were asked to indicate the proportion of family income that was spent on housing. Mothers living in subsidized housing spent a mean of 27.7% of their income on housing ($n=64$), while mothers living in private housing reported spending an average of 50.4% of their income on housing ($n=35$). This difference was highly statistically significant ($F(1, 97)=82.10$, $p < .0001$).

Mothers were questioned about their housing satisfaction. Thirty-five of the mothers responded yes or no to the question "Are you satisfied with your present living arrangements?", while 65 of the mothers were asked to rate their response to this item on a five point scale where "1" indicated they were "very satisfied" and "5" indicated they were "very dissatisfied". For the purposes of statistical analysis, the responses of mothers who were queried in the latter manner were collapsed into two categories: mothers who rated the question in the 1 to 3 range were considered to have responded yes, while those who gave ratings of 4 or 5 were placed in the no category. This allowed the responses of all mothers to be considered together. Forty percent ($n=32$) of mothers living in subsidized housing and 51% ($n=18$) of mothers living in private housing responded in a manner indicating satisfaction with their present living arrangements. The responses of the remaining mothers suggested they were not satisfied with their living arrangements. This difference between mothers living in private and public housing was not statistically reliable ($chi^2 = .04$, $p > .05$).

Housing satisfaction was also examined as a function of housing type for those mothers living in subsidized housing. As Table 6 suggests, mothers living in highrises, lowrises and townhouses did not significantly differ in their reported satisfaction with living arrangements.

Child Care Variables

In general, the single mothers reported difficulty with child care arrangements. Specifically, mothers were asked to rate the difficulty they had finding someone to look after their child(ren). Fifty-five percent (n=36) of mothers living in subsidized housing and forty-one percent (n=14) of mothers living in private housing reported that they often had difficulty with these arrangements. Thirty-five percent (n=12) of mothers living in private housing indicated that finding someone to look after their child(ren) was sometimes a problem while this was true of 28% (n=18) of mothers residing in public housing. Only 17%(n=11) of mothers living in subsidized housing and 24% (n=8) of mothers living in private accommodation indicated that they rarely encountered difficulties in this area. Responses to this item were not significantly different for mothers living in private and public housing (chi^2= 1.83, p>.05).

When questioned about formal daycare centre use, overall, 30% (n=30) of the mothers interviewed reported using a daycare centre. Daycare use was not significantly different for mothers living in subsidized housing compared to mothers living in private accommodation. Twenty-nine percent (n=19) of mothers living in public housing reported using a formal daycare centre. Similarly, thirty-one percent (n=11) of mothers living in private housing indicated use of a daycare facility (chi^2= .05, p> .05).

When requested to indicate whether they would prefer using a co-operative daycare centre or a professionally staffed facility, 55% (n=35) of the mothers living in public housing and 58% (n=19) of the mothers residing in private housing stated they would rather place their child in a professional setting. The remaining mothers living in private housing (n=14) endorsed the co-operative daycare option while 42% (n=27) of the mothers living in public housing indicated a preference for co-operative daycare and 3% (n=2) were unsure of their preference. Preferred daycare type did not significantly differentiate mothers living in private or public housing (chi^2 1.06, p> .05).

Mothers were further asked whether they would volunteer if co-operative daycare was made available in their buildings. Over three-quarters (77%, n=49) of mothers living in subsidized housing indicated their willingness to volunteer, while 19% (n=12) of these mothers would not want to participate and 5% (n=3) were unsure. Of mothers living in private housing, 59% (n=20) stated they would volunteer, 35% (n=12) indicated they would not volunteer and 6% (n=2) were unsure. These differences were not statistically significant when mothers living in public and private housing were compared (chi^2= 3.54, p> .05).

When requested to indicate how often they anticipated using evening and weekend daycare services, mothers living in subsidized housing projected more frequent use of these services than did mothers residing in private housing. Specifically, 39% (n=25) of mothers living in public housing projected using such services frequently, 53% (n=34) indicated they would use them occasionally and 8% (n=5) reported they would use them rarely. In contrast, only 24% (n=8) of mothers living in private housing anticipated frequently using evening and weekend daycare services, 49% (n=16) projected occasional use and 27% (n=9) reported that they would rarely use such services. These differences in projected use were statistically significant ($chi^2 = 7.21$, $p<.03$; Phi=.27, $p< .03$).

A high proportion of mothers both in public (87%, n=31) and private (94%, n=61) housing indicated that their families would use summer play activities or classes made available to them. Projected use of summer activities did not significantly differentiate mothers living in public and private housing ($chi^2 = 0.86$, $p>.05$).

Housing Environment - Suitability for Children

Mothers were asked various questions relating to their assessment of the impact of the housing environment on their children and whether they viewed it as adequately meeting their children's needs.

When asked whether they were satisfied with the play areas available for their children, 46% (n=16) of mothers living in private housing and 29% (n=19) of mothers living in public housing responded that they were satisfied with these arrangements. Seventy-one percent (n=46) of mothers living in public housing and 51% (n=18) of mothers residing in private accommodation replied that they were not satisfied with the available play areas. Three percent (n=1) of the mothers living in private housing responded that they were unsure. These differences between mothers living in private and public housing were not statistically significant ($chi^2 = 4.95$, $p> .05$).

Mothers were asked to specify what aspects of the available play areas they liked. Table 7 compares the responses of mothers living in public and private housing for this item. In general, compared to mothers living in private housing, mothers living in public housing more frequently identified proximity of the play area as being a favourable aspect of the available play areas. Mothers living in public housing also more frequently responded that there was nothing they liked about the available playgrounds. Mothers living in private housing more frequently stated that they liked the characteristics of the outdoor play area (space, landscaping, etc.) and the safety of the play equipment and play area than did mothers living in subsidized housing. These differences in response patterns between mothers living in public and private housing were statistically significant ($chi^2 = 12.18$, $p<$

.03). Mothers were also requested to identify what they would like changed about the available play areas. As Table 8 demonstrates differences in the responses of mothers living in public and private housing were not statistically significant for this item ($chi^2= 3.55, p> .05$). Considering all mothers together, 29% (n=28) of the time, mothers stated that they would like the safety of the play equipment and the safety and cleanliness of the playground to be improved; 26% (n=25) of the time, mothers indicated that they would like the variety and quality of play equipment and recreational facilities improved; 20% (n=20) of the time, mothers responded that they would like the play area to be supervised; adding an indoor play area/recreational facility was mentioned 13% (n=13) of the time by the mothers; improving the outdoor play area was suggested as an improvement 7% (n=7) of the time by the mothers and 5% (n=5) of the mothers' responses indicated that they were thoroughly satisfied with the available play areas and there was nothing they would change.

Table 9 describes mothers' reported levels of fear associated with having their child(ren) play outside unsupervised as a function of residency type (subsidized vs. private housing). There were no significant differences obtained when the responses of mothers living in public and private housing were compared ($chi^2= 3.36, p> .05$). In general, taking the responses of all mothers together, mothers indicated high levels of fear under these circumstances: 82% (n=80) of the mothers indicated that this was a constant concern for them; 6% (n=6) replied that it was often a concern for them; 9% (n=9) indicated that having their child(ren) play outside unsupervised was sometimes a concern for them and only 3% (n=3) of the mothers responded that this was never a concern for them.

Mothers were then asked to specify what they feared about their children's unsupervised outdoor play. Although mothers in both private and subsidized housing expressed most concern about violence from other children and adult interference (including abduction, molestation, violence, etc.), the pattern of responses between mothers in subsidized and private housing was statistically different ($chi^2= 15.19, p< .004$). As Table 10 demonstrates, compared to mothers living in public housing, mothers living in private housing more frequently described fears related to lack of safety (due to decrepid play equipment or high traffic density) or concern that their child(ren) would harm themselves (falls, etc.) in the absence of appropriate supervision. Mothers living in public housing more frequently expressed concern about the presence of drugs/drug dealers/drug addicts or drunks in the area as well violence from other children than did mothers residing in private accommodation.

When asked whether they felt that their housing needs changed as their children got older, 79% (n=51) of mothers living in public housing and 91% of mothers living in private housing agreed that they had while the remaining mothers disagreed with this item. This difference between mother living in private and subsidized housing was not statistically reliable (chi^2= 2.54, p> .05).

Finally, mothers were questioned as to whether they felt that their children had suffered (problems with health, school, law, etc.) as a result of their housing situation. The responses of all mothers was similar. Sixty-one percent (n=39) of mothers living in public housing and sixty percent (n=21) of mothers living in private housing indicated that they felt their children had suffered due to their housing situation. This difference between mothers living in private and public housing was not statistically reliable (chi^2=.01, p>.05).

Transportation

Mothers were asked to indicate which of the following modes of transportation they used on a regular basis: car (travelling alone), car (travelling with others), public transportation, walking, bicycling and travelling by taxi. Table 11 presents reported usage of all transportation modes for mothers living in public housing, private housing and combined. Mothers residing in public housing significantly differed from mothers living in private housing only in their reported use of a car (travelling alone). Thirty-four percent (n=12) of mothers living in private housing reported travelling by car alone, while only 17% (n=11) of mothers living in public housing indicated using this form of transportation (chi^2= 3.87, p< .05; Phi=.17, p< .05). When all mothers were considered together, mothers reported using public transportation most frequently (75%, n=74), followed by walking (43%, n=43), travelling by car (alone) (23%, n=23), travelling by car with others (7%, n=7), bicycling (7%, n=7) and travelling by taxi (5%, n=5).

Forty percent (n=14) of mothers residing in private housing reported having access to a car on a regular basis, whereas only 26% (n=17) of mothers living in subsidized housing indicated such access. This difference however, was not statistically significant (chi^2= 2.04, p> .05). For those mothers who reported owning a vehicle, 81% (n=13) of those living in public housing and 79% (n=11) of those living in private housing indicated that access to adequate parking facilities was provided at their residences. Parking availability did not significantly differentiate mothers living in public or private housing (chi^2=.03, p>.05).

As Table 12 demonstrates, almost three quarters (74%) of all mothers reported encountering difficulty getting places due to transportation problems at least some of the time. Mothers living in public housing were not significantly different from mothers residing in private accommodation in their reporting of transportation difficulties (chi^2=4.21, p> .05).

Desirability of On-Site Services

Table 13 compares the responses of mothers living in public and private housing when questioned about the desirability of locating a variety of services at the housing site. Mothers living in private and public housing had similar preferences for services. The exception to this was the desirability of evening courses. Though three-quarters of mothers living in both residential types (75% (n=49) of mothers living in public housing and 77% (n=26) of mothers living in private housing) indicated that they would like evening courses offered on-site, the remaining mothers living in private housing were not interested in this option while 11% (n=7) of mothers living in public housing did not want evening courses and 14% (n=9) were unsure. These different response patterns were statistically significant (chi^2= 7.11, p< .05). Considering the responses of the mothers living in public and private housing together, 77% of the mothers indicated they would like on-site health services; 76% agreed they would like a library; 67% would like a toy exchange; 54% would like fast food outlets and/or low cost restaurants located near the building; 51% would like a tuck shop/convenience store on-site; 47% would like an automated teller; 42% expressed their desire for on-site social service agencies and 23% would like dry cleaning facilities located at the building site (see Table 13).

Mothers who indicated that they wanted or were unsure about the desirability of having evening courses offered at the building site were further asked what type of courses would be of interest to them. As Table 14 indicates mothers living in subsidized and private housing were similar in their views about which courses would be of interest. The only exception was when mothers were asked whether or not they would be interested in taking a parenting course made available to them on-site. Sixty-seven percent of mothers living in private housing indicated they would want a parenting course offered in contrast to only 38% of mothers living in public housing. The remaining mothers indicated they would not be interested in a parenting course. This difference between mothers living in public and private housing was statistically reliable (chi^2= 6.11, p< .01). With respect to the other course options, when the responses of all mothers were considered together, 57% indicated interest in educational upgrading courses; 49% were interested in courses focusing on non-traditional skill development (e.g. woodworking, upholstery, home repair); 44% wanted courses offered on child health; 43% wanted courses offered on diet and nutrition;
35% expressed interest in courses on money management and 17% responded they would be interested in having on-site English lessons offered (see Table 14).

Maintenance of Housing Unit/Building Complex

Mothers were asked to indicate who was responsible for the maintenance of their apartments. Seventy-one percent (n=46) of mothers living in subsidized housing reported that the superintendent/building owner was responsible, 25% (n=16) reported that both themselves and the superintendent/building owner were responsible and 5% (n=3) reported being solely responsible for the maintenance of their apartments. Mothers living in private housing showed a significantly different response pattern. Sixty-six percent (n=23) of these mothers indicated that the superintendent/building owner was responsible for apartment maintenance, while 23% (n=8) reported having sole responsibility and 11% (n=4) indicated joint responsibility between themselves and superintendents/building owners (chi^2= 8.95, p< .01; Phi=.30, p<.01).

When questioned about maintenance problems, 56% (n=36) of mothers living in subsidized housing reported difficulties with maintenance, while 65% (n=22) of mothers living in private housing reported maintenance problems. This difference was not statistically reliable (chi^2= .66, p>.05).

Similarly, mothers were asked whether they were satisfied with the cleanliness, level of maintenance of the streets, walkways, parks and playgrounds in the vicinity. Fifty-one percent of mothers living in subsidized housing indicated satisfaction in this area, while 63% of mothers living in private housing reported satisfaction. This difference however, was not statistically significant (chi^2= 1.34, p>.05).

The proportion of mothers reporting problems with household pests was similar for mothers residing in both private (77%, n=27) and public (76%, n=49) housing (chi^2= .04, p>.05). The proportion of mothers reporting access to reliable pest control was again similar for both private (60%, n=21) and public (66%, n=42) housing residents (chi^2= .55, p>.05).

Less than half of all mothers interviewed reported satisfaction with the temperature of their apartments. Only 32% (n=21) of mothers living in subsidized housing indicated that the temperature of their apartments was "just right", 35% (n=23) reported that the apartment was "too warm", 25% (n=16) stated it was "too cold" and 8% (n=5) reported that it was too cold in winter and too warm in summer. Of women living in private housing, 40% (n=14) reported finding the temperature of their apartments "just right", 37% (n=13) indicated that their apartment was "too cold", 17%(n=6) stated it was "too warm" and 6% (n=2) responded that it was too cold in winter and too warm in summer. The pattern of responses for mothers living in public housing compared to private housing was not significantly different (chi^2= 4.35, p> .05).

Desirability of Appliances Within the Home

Mothers were asked whether they would prefer using a common laundry room or having washer/dryer facilities within their own apartment. Mothers overwhelmingly indicated a preference for having washer/dryer facilities within their home. Ninety-seven percent (n=63) of mothers living in subsidized housing selected this option and ninety-four percent (n=33) of mothers residing in private housing responded with this preference. There was not a statistically reliable difference between mothers living in public or private housing on this item (chi^2= .41, p> .05).

Mothers were further asked to rank order their preference for having the following items in their homes: video cassette recorder (V.C.R.), freezer, dishwasher, microwave oven, air conditioning, humidifier, washer/dryer and television. Mothers were instructed to order these items as if they owned none of them. Table 15 describes the proportion of mothers assigning each rank to all items for mothers living in public, private housing and for all mothers considered together. As Table 15 indicates, order of item preference was not significantly different for those mothers living in private or public housing. Considering all mothers together, the washer/dryer was ranked first by 39% of the mothers; the television was ranked first by 35% of the mothers; 16% of the mothers ranked the freezer as their first selection; air conditioning was ranked first by 12% of the mothers; the humidifier was ranked first by 6% of the mothers; 4% of the mothers ranked the dishwasher first; 3% of the mothers chose the microwave oven as their first selection; and 1% of the mothers ranked the V.C.R. first.

Convenience of Essential Services

Mothers were requested to rate the accessibility of the following essential services: grocery shopping, medical, dental, and legal. Table 16 describes mothers' ratings of the accessibility of these services for mothers living in public, private housing and for all mothers combined. As Table 16 indicates, mothers' service accessibility ratings did not differ significantly whether they lived in private or public housing. In general, all services received high ratings of accessibility. Eighty-nine percent of all mothers rated medical services as either very or somewhat accessible; eighty-one percent of all mothers rated legal services as either very or somewhat accessible; seventy-eight percent of all mothers rated dental services as either very or somewhat accessible and sixty-three percent of all mothers responded that it was either very or somewhat convenient for them to grocery shop.

In addition, mothers indicated their degree of satisfaction with medical, legal and dental services. Of those mothers living in public housing, 23% (n=15) responded that they were extremely satisfied with these arrangements; 45% (n=29) reported being somewhat satisfied; 9% (n=6) reported being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 14% (n=9) responded that they were somewhat dissatisfied and 9% (n=6) reported being extremely dissatisfied. Of those mothers residing in private housing 23% (n=8) reported that they were extremely satisfied with these service arrangements; 26% (n=9) reported being somewhat satisfied; 11% (n=4) reported being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 29% (n=10) reported that they were somewhat dissatisfied and 11% (n=4) indicated that they were extremely dissatisfied. Mothers living in private housing were not significantly different from mothers residing in subsidized housing in their ratings of satisfaction with these services ($chi^2 = 4.96$, $p > .05$).

Social Support

Social support variables were examined first to compare those mothers living in public housing to those living in private housing and second to compare those mothers living in different types of housing (highrises, lowrises, townhouses, shared accommodation, other) for those mothers living in public housing.

Table 17 compares the responses of mothers living in public and private housing on the following social support items: whether the mothers know their neighbours, whether they currently participate in neighbourhood watch, their projected participation in neighbourhood watch, their preferred neighbourhood grouping (either with other single mothers or a mixed neighbourhood), their satisfaction with their number of friends, their satisfaction with the amount of time they have to spend with friends and their involvement in counselling. Table 18 compares the responses of mothers living in highrises, lowrises and townhouses along these same social support variables for mothers living in subsidized housing.

As these tables indicate there were no significant differences between mothers living in public and private housing, nor were there reliable differences between mothers living in subsidized housing when types of housing were compared. When the responses of all mothers were taken together, 79% of the women stated they knew their neighbours (next door, down the hall); 8% indicated they currently participated in a neighbourhood/building watch type program and 83% said they would participate in a neighbourhood/building watch type program were it organized. When asked to indicate their preferred neighbourhood grouping, 81% of the mothers stated they would like to live in a mixed neighbourhood; 14% said they would prefer living with other single mothers and 5% were undecided. Mothers were also asked about their friendship patterns. Fifty-six percent of those interviewed indicated they had just the right number of friends, 37% replied they did not have enough friends and 7% stated they had too many friends; 61% of mothers responded that they did not have enough time to spend with friends, while the remaining mothers stated that they did. Fifty-two percent of the mothers interviewed indicated that they had received counselling, while 48% replied that they hadn't.

Configuration of Interior Space

Mothers were questioned about the existing interior space of their residences as well as projected changes they would make to the interior. Tables 19 and 20 present mothers' responses to the items concerning actual interior space as a function of residential type (subsidized vs. private), while Tables 21 and 22 compare the responses of mothers living in subsidized housing as a function of housing type (highrise, lowrise and townhouse) for these same items. As Table 19 indicates there was only one significant difference in the residential interior design between mothers living in subsidized and private housing. Specifically, mothers living in subsidized housing had significantly more bedrooms ($x=2.4$) than did mothers living in private accommodation ($x=1.86$) (Multivariate $F(2,97)=9.37$, $p<.001$; Univariate $F(1,98)=8.89$, $p<.01$); however, as the earlier reported results indicate, mothers living in subsidized housing also had significantly more children than did mothers living in private accommodation. Fifty-three percent of all mothers indicated that the number of bedrooms they had was adequate, the rest of mothers did not. Mothers living in subsidized housing reported living in a mean number of 4.63 rooms excluding the bathroom; similarly mothers living in private housing reported a mean number of 4.17 rooms. This difference was not statistically significant ($F(1,98)=4.80$, $p>.05$). Sixty-one percent of all mothers replied that their kitchen and dining room were separate; 53% had a separate living room, while for the rest it was combined with another room; 40% of all mothers indicated that the amount of storage/closet space was adequate and 43% of the mothers reported having access to storage space elsewhere in the building.

When the type of housing was compared for mothers living in subsidized housing several differences emerged (see Tables 21 and 22). When the number of rooms excluding the bathroom were compared mothers living in lowrises reported a mean number of 4.33 rooms, mothers living in highrises reported a mean number of 4.03 rooms while mothers living in townhouses reported a mean number of 6.06 rooms. These differences were statistically significant ($F(2,59)=29.13$, $p<.0001$). The results of comparisons suggested that mothers living in townhouses had significantly more rooms than did mothers in the other two housing forms ($t(2,59)=7.24$, $p<.001$). Mothers living in lowrises had a mean number of 2.33 bedrooms, mothers living in highrises had a mean number of 2.03 bedrooms while mothers living in townhouses had a mean number of 3.28 bedrooms. A MANOVA procedure was conducted to compare these groups using the correlated dependent variables of number of children and number of bedrooms as dependent variables. These differences were statistically significant for both number of bedrooms (Multivariate $F(2,116)=8.52$, $p<.001$; Univariate $F(2,59)=17.06$, $p<.001$) and number of children (Univariate $F(2,59)=8.28$, $p<.001$). Results of comparisons suggested that mothers living in townhouses had significantly more bedrooms than did either mothers living in lowrises or highrises

(Multivariate Comparison $F(2,58)=15.87$, $p<.001$; Univariate Comparison $F(1,59)= 16.31$, $p<.001$). In addition, mothers living in townhouses had significantly more children than did mothers living in lowrises or highrises (Univariate Comparison $F(1,59)=28.03$, $p<.001$).

As Table 22 suggests a significantly larger proportion of mothers living in townhouses and lowrises reported that the number of bedrooms in their homes was adequate when compared to women living in highrises ($chi^2= 6.47$, $p< .04$). A significantly larger percentage of mothers living in highrise and lowrise apartment buildings reported having access to storage elsewhere in the building than did mothers living in townhouses ($chi^2= 8.12$, $p< .05$). Mothers living in different housing types did not differ significantly along any of the remaining items concerned with interior space configuration (see Table 22).

Mothers were asked to indicate which of the following changes they would make to their apartments if they had the same amount of space as they presently had: (1) more, but smaller bedrooms or a larger kitchen or neither; (2) smaller bedrooms in exchange for a larger living room; (3) a larger kitchen, smaller living room; (4) larger kitchen, smaller bedrooms; (4) larger bedrooms, smaller living room; (5) extra bathroom, smaller other rooms; (6) shower and sink separate from toilet and (7) smaller bedrooms, but more of them. As Table 23 indicates only one difference emerged when mothers living in subsidized housing were compared to mothers living in private housing. Specifically, when asked whether they would prefer to have smaller bedrooms, but more of them or a larger kitchen and a smaller living room or neither a larger proportion of mothers living in public housing selected the larger kitchen option, while a larger percentage of mothers living in private housing selected the increased number of smaller bedrooms option. This difference was statistically significant ($chi^2= 5.88$, $p<.05$). Table 24 compares the responses of mothers living in subsidized housing to these items as a function of housing type (lowrise, highrise or townhouse). As this table indicates, there were no significant differences in the responses of mothers living in public housing when they were compared as a function of housing type.

Safety

Mothers were asked a variety of questions relating to different aspects of the safety of their living environment: adequacy of lighting, fear associated with various building locations, the prevalence of drugs/drinking, theft/vandalism and satisfaction with the policing of the housing complex. Each of these issues is discussed in turn below.

(a) Lighting Adequacy

Mothers were asked whether the lighting was adequate in the following building locations: hallways, stairwells, lobby, elevators, parking areas, laundry rooms and outdoor paths. Table 25 presents the mothers responses to these items as a function of whether or not they resided in subsidized housing. In general, at least 80% of all mothers considered together reported that lighting was adequate in the following locations: hallways, stairwells, lobby, elevators and laundry rooms. Forty-four percent of all mothers indicated that lighting was adequate in the parking areas, while 49.5% said it was inadequate and 6.6% replied that they didn't know. With respect to lighting surrounding outdoor paths, 42% of the mothers living in subsidized housing compared to 69% of the mothers living in private housing reported that the lighting was adequate in these areas. The remainder of the mothers living in private housing reported that the lighting surrounding outdoor paths was inadequate while of the remaining mothers living in public housing, 56% indicated the lighting was inadequate and 2% didn't know. These differences were statistically significant ($chi^2 = 6.23$, $p<.05$). As Table 26 illustrates, lighting adequacy did not differ for mothers living in public housing when mothers living in highrises, lowrises and townhouses were compared for any of the building locations.

(b) Fear Associated with Various Building Locations

Mothers were asked to rate on a five point scale their degree of fear associated with the following locations: building, apartment, elevators, laundry room, hallways, stairwells and outside areas where 1 indicated "extremely afraid" and 5 indicated "extremely relaxed". As Table 27 demonstrates, a larger proportion of mothers living in subsidized housing gave hallways and stairwells higher fear ratings than did mothers living in private housing ($chi^2 = 9.60$, $p<.05$ for hallways; $chi^2 = 10.41$, $p<.05$ for stairwells). Mothers living in public and private housing did not differ in their ratings of fear associated with the remaining locations. As Table 28 illustrates, when mothers in public housing were compared according to whether they lived in highrises, lowrises or townhouses, there were no significant differences in their ratings of fear for any of the building locations examined.

(c) Theft/Vandalism, Building Security & Satisfaction with Policing

Mothers were asked various questions relating to the prevalence of theft/vandalism in their buildings as well as concerning the adequacy of the locks, and security of the building. As Table 29 indicates, several differences emerged when the responses of mothers living in subsidized and private housing were compared for these items. Sixty-five percent of mothers living in public housing compared to only 31% of mothers living in private housing indicated problems with vandalism in their buildings. The remaining mothers responded that there were not vandalism problems in their buildings. This difference was statistically reliable ($chi^2 = 10.06$, $p<.01$). Consistent with this result, 69% of mothers living in subsidized housing compared to 43% of mothers living in private housing reported that theft/vandalism was of concern to them. Again this represented a statistically significant difference between the two groups of mothers (chi^2= 6.59, p<.01). Fifty-one percent of mothers living in private housing in contrast to only 24% of mothers living in public housing indicated that they felt the building the lived in was secure, while the remaining mothers reported that they did not feel their building was secure. This difference was significantly reliable (chi^2= 7.68, p<.01). Mothers' reported satisfaction with the policing of the housing complex significantly differentiated mothers living in subsidized and private housing (see Table 29). As Table 29 further suggests the responses of mothers living in public and private housing were not significantly different for any of the following items: security of locks on apartment doors; the occurrence of a threatening incident; apartment break-in or theft of any type.

As Table 30 indicates when the responses of mothers living in lowrises, highrises and townhouses were compared for mothers residing in public housing, only the item concerned with problems with building vandalism significantly distinguished the mothers on the basis of housing type. Specifically, a larger proportion of mothers living in highrises (83%) and lowrises (80%) reported difficulty with vandalism in their buildings than did mothers living in townhouses (24%) (see Table 30).

(d) Prevalence/Problems with Drugs/Alcohol

As Table 31 suggests the experience of mothers living in subsidized housing compared to mothers living in private housing was reported to be considerably different when issues of drug/alcohol related difficulties at the building site were considered. When asked whether drugs/alcohol were a problem in their building or grounds, 65% of mothers living in subsidized housing stated it was a considerable problem, 20% rated it as being somewhat of a problem, while only 5% stated it was a minor problem, 3% no problem and 5% stated they didn't know. In contrast, a larger proportion of mothers living in private housing rated drugs/alcohol as being either a minor problem, no problem or they didn't know, while only 43% of these mothers reported it was a considerable problem or somewhat a problem. These differences were statistically significant (chi^2= 24.60, p<.0001). Similarly, when questioned about drug availability, 77% of mothers living in public housing stated that drugs were either very or somewhat available while only 49% of mothers residing in private housing endorsed these options. A larger proportion of mothers living in private housing stated that drugs were extremely hard to obtain or that they didn't know than did mothers living in public housing. These differences were statistically reliable (chi^2= 18.25, p<.001).

Mothers were further asked the level of concern they had about whether their child(ren) had access to drugs or alcohol in the building or grounds. Eighty-four percent of mothers living in public housing replied that they were very or somewhat concerned about this issue compared to 57% of the mothers living in private housing who responded in this manner. Thirty-four percent of mothers living in private housing responded that they were not at all concerned that their children had access to drugs/alcohol in the building or grounds, while only twenty-six percent of mothers living in subsidized housing gave this response. These differences were statistically significant ($chi^2 = 8.97$, $p < .05$).

Table 32 compares the responses of mothers living in subsidized housing as a function of housing type. As this table suggests there were no significant differences in the responses of mothers living in highrises, lowrises or townhouses to these items related to drug/alcohol problems.

Policy Recommendations

The interview data may be particularly useful for policy recommendations regarding the housing needs and priorities for single mother led families. In Canada, single mother led families suffer economically, with their children being vulnerable to a variety of social, psychological and medical problems. These families may be even further jeopardized by the high housing costs and difficulty in obtaining housing in the current Toronto market. The responses of the present respondents indicate how this disadvantaged group perceives their housing and social needs. As far as we know, it is the only data where Canadian single mothers express their own views as to their housing needs. Rather than relying upon "expert" judgments, we have encouraged these mothers to consider various alternative arrangements and to indicate what works well for them in housing and what is less satisfactory.

The general consensus was that child care was difficult to obtain, especially for those mothers living in subsidized housing. It is important to emphasize the strong desire of these mothers to enter the labour force as either full or part-time workers. The difficulties with child care--long waiting lists, lack of subsidized spaces, inability to find infant daycare and cost may effectively remove these mothers from the work force and prolong their period of dependency upon public assistance and subsidized housing. Although actual levels of daycare use did not differ between mothers in subsidized housing and private housing, the mothers in public housing expressed greater difficulty in securing daycare places for their children. We would recommend that daycare centres be provided in public housing, with these needs considered when planning and designing public housing buildings.

Mothers generally expressed fear in having their children play outdoors and often expressed concern over the quality of the play equipment that was provided. We would recommend that children's outdoor play spaces be supervised by paid employees--possibly the parents themselves. We would also recommend examining the safety and adequacy of the play equipment to ensure that the equipment is well maintained. Mothers expressed fear that their communities contained drug dealers, derelicts, alcoholics and other undesirables who constituted a perceived threat to the safety of their families. Mothers in public housing felt that vandalism and children's accessibility to drugs were special problems for their communities. It is obvious that better policing is required to reassure these parents. Community based policing with visible patrols might be implented.

Single mothers were seen to rely upon public transportation and the majority expressed difficulties with mass transportation. An examination of bus routing/scheduling in neighbourhoods containing public housing is suggested. The placement of bus stops in convenient, well lit places near the resident's home would be urged, along with posted schedules and token vending machines in the building complex should be considered by transportation agencies.

Mothers expressed a strong interest in educational upgrading courses and in acquiring nontraditional skills (i.e., upholstery, woodworking, etc.) that could be offered in their buildings. Giving these courses in the actual buildings that the mothers live in would reduce fears about travel after dark and difficulties with transportation. By making it easier for these mothers to attend these classes, the proportion of women enrolled in such classes would grow. These courses might reduce the proportion of impoverished single mothers relying upon public assistance by providing skills needed for employment.

The arrangement of space in housing may also need review. Mothers in public housing recommended increasing the size of the kitchen, while those in private housing urged an increase in the number of bedrooms. Washers and dryers were the most desired appliances for these single mothers. Mothers with young children, possessing a small wardrobe frequently need to wash clothing. Mothers felt public laundry rooms (usually located in basements) were dangerous places and feared theft of their clothes if they left the laundry room. The provision of space and provision of washers and dryers (possibly by means of rental arrangements) in the dwelling unit would allow mothers to spend more time with their children and would free up laundry rooms for other uses (sites for educational courses, daycare, clinics, etc.).

Mothers did not wish to live in exclusively single mother communities, but prefered to be in an integrated community that would not stigmatize them. These mothers expressed a concern that they had been discriminated against in seeking housing because they were either single parents or welfare recipients or both. Housing arrangements should be considered that offer an alternative to large numbers of single parents living in highrise public buildings. One possiblity might be to encourage the use of larger, older homes that could be shared by two or three families. Subsidies to rent townhouses or smaller homes could be provided to single parents not wishing to share the responsibilities of maintaining a house or working out cooperative child care arrangements.

Table 1

Single-mother sample as a function of recruitment method.

Method Sample	n	Percent of Total
1.Radio announcement (CBC)	2	2
2.Posters	2	2
3.Newspaper Advertisement (Toronto Star)	17	17
4.Community Organizations	43	43
5.Community Organizations with social services available	2	2
6.Personal Referrals	27	27
7.Daycare Centres	7	7
Total	100	100

Table 2

Demographic characteristics of single mothers: Country of Origin.

Country	n	Percentage of Total Sample
Canada	71	71
West Indies	11	11
Western Europe	5	5
Eastern Europe	3	3
South/Latin America	2	2
Great Britain	2	2
USA	2	2
Asia	2	2
Africa	2	2
India	1	1
Total	100	100

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of single mothers: Mothers living in private and public housing.

Marital Status

	Never Married		Separated		Divorced		Widowed		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	34	52.3	12	18.5	17	26.2	2	3.1	65	65.0
Private	16	45.7	11	31.4	7	20.0	1	2.9	35	35.0
Total	50	50.0	23	23.0	24	24.0	3	3.0	100	100.0
chi^2	2.22									
Phi	0.15									

Time Since Separated/Divorced/ Widowed

	1 Year or Less		1 to 3 Years		3 Years or More		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	10	35.7	7	25.0	11	39.3	28	62.2
Private	7	41.2	7	41.2	3	5.3	17	38.7
Total	17	37.8	14	31.1	14	31.1	45	100.0
chi^2	2.56							
Phi	0.24							

Maternal Age

	15-24		25-29		30 and over		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	13	20.0	19	29.2	33	50.8	65	65.0
Private	6	17.1	8	22.9	21	60.0	35	35.0
Total	19	19.0	27	27.0	54	54.0	100	100.0
chi^2	0.80							
Phi	0.09							

Country of Birth

	Canadian		Other		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	43	66.2	22	33.8	65	65.0

Private	28	80.0	7	20.0	35	35.0
Total	71	71.0	29	29.0	100	100.0
chi^2	2.12					
Phi	0.15					

Table 3

Demographic Characteristics of single mothers: Mothers living in private and public housing, continued.

	Maternal Educational Level									
	Less Than High School		High-School Graduate		College/ Univ.		College/ Univ. Degree		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	28	43.1	12	18.5	13	20.0	12	18.5	65	65.0
Private	11	31.4	3	8.6	11	31.4	10	28.6	35	35.0
Total	39	39.0	15	15.0	24	24.0	22	22.0	100	100.0
chi^2	4.57									
Phi	0.21									

Table 4

Current and Desired Employment Status of Single Mothers: A comparison of mothers living in private and public housing.

	Current Employment Status							
	Full-Time		Part-time		Not Employed		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	7	10.8	9	13.8	49	75.4	65	65.0
Private	11	31.4	6	17.1	18	51.4	35	35.0
Total	18	18.0	15	15.0	67	67.0	100	100.0
chi^2		7.50*						
Phi		0.27*						

	Desired Employment Status							
	Full-Time		Part-time		Not Employed		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	16	33.3	22	45.8	10	20.8	48	73.8
Private	3	17.6	5	29.4	9	52.9	17	26.2
Total	19	29.2	27	41.5	19	29.2	65	100.0
chi^2		6.30*						
Phi		0.31*						

* $p < .05$

Table 5

Mothers living in private and public housing as a function of housing type: lowrise, highrise, townhouse, shared accommodation, other.

	Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	15	23.1	6	17.1	21	21.0
Highrise	30	46.2	7	20.0	37	37.0
Townhouse	17	26.2	1	2.9	18	18.0
Shared	1	1.5	14	40.0	15	15.0
Other	2	3.1	7	20.0	9	9.0
Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	41.12***					
Phi	0.64***					

***p < .0001

Table 6

Satisfaction with present living arrangements as a function of housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse) for mothers living in public housing.

Are you satisfied with your present living arrangements?

	Yes		No		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	6	40.0	9	60.0	15	24.2
Highrise	17	56.7	13	43.3	30	48.4
Townhouse	8	47.1	9	52.9	17	27.4
Total	31	50.0	31	50.0	62	100.0

chi^2	1.19
Phi	0.14

Table 7

Positive aspects of play areas identified by single mothers as a function of housing type (public vs. private).

	Housing Type					
	Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Positive Aspects	n	%	n	%	n	%
Outdoor Play Area	4	6.2	7	20.0	11	11.0
Available Equipment	14	21.5	10	28.6	24	24.0
Proximity	18	27.7	4	11.4	22	22.0
Safety of Area/Equipment	3	4.6	5	14.3	8	8.0
Nothing	17	26.2	4	11.4	21	21.0
Other	9	13.8	5	14.3	14	14.0
Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0

chi^2 12.18*
Phi 0.35*

*p < .05

Table 8

Suggested improvments for play areas: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing.

	Housing Type					
	Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Improve-ments	n	%	n	%	n	%
Improve Outdoor Play Area	3	4.7	4	2.4	7	7.1
Improve Equipment/ Recreational Facilities	15	23.4	10	29.4	25	25.5
Improve Safety	18	28.1	10	29.4	28	28.6
Supvervised Play Area	15	23.4	5	14.7	20	20.4
Indoor Play Area	10	15.6	3	8.8	13	13.3
Nothing	3	4.7	2	5.9	5	5.1
Total	64	65.3	34	34.7	98	100.0

chi^2	3.54
Phi	0.19

Table 9

Single mothers' reported levels of fear associated with child(ren)'s unsupervised outdoor play as a function of housing type (public vs. private).

Item: Are you ever afraid of having your child play outdoors in unsupervised areas?

	Constantly		Often		Sometimes		Never		Total	
Housing Type	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	53	82.8	2	3.1	7	10.9	2	3.1	64	65.3
Private	27	79.4	4	11.8	2	5.9	1	2.9	34	34.7
Total	80	81.6	6	6.1	9	9.2	3	3.1	98	100.0

chi^2 3.36
Phi 0.19

Table 10

Single mothers concerns about child(ren)'s unsupervised outdoor play: Mothers living in private and public housing compared.

Concern	Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Adult Interference	6	9.7	12	36.4	18	18.9
Lack of Safety	4	6.5	3	9.1	7	7.4
Harming Self	6	9.7	6	18.2	12	12.6
Drug dealers/ addicts/drunks	9	14.5	1	3.0	10	10.5
Violence from other children	37	59.7	11	33.3	48	50.5
Total	62	65.3	33	34.7	95	100.0

chi^2 15.19**
Phi 0.40**

**p < .01

Table 11

Reported usage of transportation modes: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing.

Transportation Mode	Public Housing Yes %/n	Public Housing No %/n)	Private Housing Yes %/n	Private Housing No %/n	Total Yes %/n	Total No %/n
Public Transportation	79.7/51	20.3/13	65.7/23	34.3/12	74.7/74	25.3/25
chi^2	2.34					
Phi	0.15					
Walk	50.0/32	50.0/32	31.4/11	68.6/24	43.4/43	56.6/56
chi^2	3.18					
Phi	0.18					
Car(alone)	16.9/11	83.1/54	34.3/12	65.7/23	23.0/23	77.0/77
chi^2	3.87*					
Phi	0.20*					
Car(others)	6.3/4	93.8/60	8.6/3	91.4/32	7.1/7	92.9/92
chi^2	0.19					
Phi	0.04					
Bicycle	4.7/3	95.3/61	11.4/4	88.6/31	7.1/7	92.9/92
chi^2	1.56					
Phi	0.13					
Taxi	3.2/5	60.8/59	00.0/0	100.0/35	5.1/5	94.9/94
chi^2	2.88					
Phi	0.17					

* $p < .05$

Table 12

Single mothers' reported transportation difficulty as a function of housing type (public vs. private).

Item: Do you have trouble getting places because of transportation problems?

Housing Type	Constantly		Often		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	13	20.0	13	20.0	24	36.9	15	23.1	65	65.0
Private	3	8.6	10	28.6	11	31.4	11	31.4	35	35.0
Total	16	16.0	23	23.0	35	35.0	26	26.0	100	100.0

chi^2 3.39
Phi 0.18

Table 13

Desirability of on-site services: Single mothers living in public and private housing compared.

Housing Type	Service Evening Courses Yes n	%	No n	%	Don't Know n	%	Total n	%
Public	49	75.4	7	10.8	9	13.8	65	65.7
Private	26	76.5	8	23.5	0	00.0	34	34.3
Total	75	75.8	15	15.2	9	9.1	99	100.0

chi^2 7.11*
Phi 0.27*

Housing Type	Health Services Yes n	%	No n	%	Don't Know n	%	Total n	%
Public	53	81.5	12	18.5	0	00.0	65	65.7
Private	23	67.6	11	32.4	0	00.0	34	34.3
Total	76	76.8	23	23.2	0	00.0	99	100.0

chi^2 2.42
Phi 0.16

Housing Type	Library Yes n	%	No n	%	Don't Know n	%	Total n	%
Public	48	73.8	17	26.2	0	00.0	65	65.7
Private	27	79.4	7	20.6	0	00.0	34	34.3
Total	75	75.8	15	15.2	9	00.0	99	100.0

chi^2 0.38
Phi 0.06

Housing Type	Toy Exchange Yes n	%	No n	%	Don't Know n	%	Total n	%

Public	41	63.1	24	36.9	0	00.0	65	65.7
Private	25	73.5	9	26.5	0	00.0	34	34.3
Total	66	66.7	33	33.3	0	00.0	99	100.0

chi^2	1.10
Phi	0.11

Table 13

Desirability of on-site services: Single mothers living in public and private housing compared, continued.

Service

Housing Type		Fast Food/Low Cost Restaurants							
		Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public		38	59.4	26	40.6	0	00.0	64	65.3
Private		15	44.1	19	55.9	0	00.0	34	34.7
Total		53	54.1	45	45.9	0	00.0	98	100.0
chi^2	2.08								
Phi	0.15								

Housing Type		Tuck Shop/Convenience Store							
		Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public		34	52.3	31	47.7	0	00.0	65	65.7
Private		16	47.1	18	52.9	0	00.0	34	34.3
Total		50	50.5	49	49.5	0	00.0	99	100.0
chi^2	0.25								
Phi	0.05								

Housing Type		Automated Teller							
		Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public		28	43.1	37	56.9	0	00.0	65	65.7
Private		18	52.9	16	47.1	0	00.0	34	34.3
Total		46	46.5	53	53.5	0	00.0	99	100.0
chi^2	0.87								
Phi	0.09								

Housing Type		Social Service Agencies							
		Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%

Public	30	46.2	34	52.3	1	1.5	65	65.7
Private	12	35.3	22	64.7	0	00.0	34	34.3
Total	42	42.4	56	56.6	1	1.0	99	100.0

chi^2	1.75
Phi	0.13

Table 13

Desirability of on-site services: Single mothers living in public and private housing compared, continued.

	Service Dry Cleaners							
Housing Type	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	12	18.5	53	81.5	0	00.0	65	65.7
Private	11	32.4	23	67.6	0	00.0	34	34.3
Total	23	23.2	76	76.8	0	00.0	99	100.0

chi^2 2.42
Phi 0.16

* $p < .05$

Table 14

Reported interest in on-site courses: Single mothers living in public and private housing compared.

Course

Educational Upgrading

Housing Type	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	35	60.3	23	39.7	0	00.0	58	68.2
Private	13	48.1	14	51.9	0	00.0	27	31.8
Total	48	56.5	377	43.5	0	00.0	85	100.0

chi^2 1.11
Phi 0.11

Non-Traditional Skills

Housing Type	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	30	51.7	28	48.3	0	00.0	58	68.2
Private	12	44.4	15	55.6	0	00.0	27	31.8
Total	42	49.4	43	50.6	0	00.0	85	100.0

chi^2 0.39
Phi 0.07

Parenting

Housing Type	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	22	37.9	36	62.1	0	00.0	58	68.2
Private	18	66.7	9	33.3	0	00.0	27	31.8
Total	40	47.1	45	52.9	0	00.0	85	100.0

chi^2 6.11**
Phi 0.27**

Child Health

Housing Type	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%

Public	24	41.4	34	58.6	0	00.0	58	68.2
Private	13	48.1	14	51.9	0	00.0	27	31.8
Total	37	43.5	48	56.5	0	00.0	85	100.0

chi^2 0.34
Phi 0.06

Table 14

Reported interest in on-site courses: Single mothers living in public and private housing compared, continued.

Course

Diet and Nutrition

Housing Type	Yes n	%	No n	%	Don't Know n	%	Total n	%
Public	26	44.8	32	55.2	0	00.0	58	68.2
Private	10	37.0	17	63.0	0	00.0	27	31.8
Total	36	42.4	49	57.6	0	00.0	85	100.0

chi^2 0.46
Phi 0.07

Money Management

Housing Type	Yes n	%	No n	%	Don't Know n	%	Total n	%
Public	21	36.2	37	63.8	0	00.0	58	68.2
Private	9	33.3	18	66.7	0	00.0	27	31.8
Total	30	35.3	55	64.7	0	00.0	85	100.0

chi^2 0.67
Phi 0.03

English Lessons

Housing Type	Yes n	%	No n	%	Don't Know n	%	Total n	%
Public	10	17.2	48	82.8	0	00.0	58	68.2
Private	4	14.8	23	85.2	0	00.0	27	31.8
Total	14	16.5	71	83.5	0	00.0	85	100.0

chi^2 0.08
Phi 0.03

** $p < .01$

Table 15

Desirability of appliances in the home: Single mothers living in public and private housing compared.

		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Appliance	Rank	n	%	n	%	n	%
Washer/Dryer	1	28	43.1	11	31.4	39	39.0
	2	12	18.5	10	28.6	22	22.0
	3	17	26.2	6	17.1	23	23.0
	4	4	6.2	4	11.4	8	8.0
	5	1	1.5	3	8.6	4	4.0
	6	3	4.6	0	00.0	3	3.0
	7	0	00.0	1	2.9	1	1.0
	8	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Total		65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	9.73						
Phi	0.31						
Television	1	21	32.3	14	40.0	35	35.0
	2	16	24.6	8	22.9	24	24.0
	3	7	10.8	3	8.6	10	10.0
	4	9	13.8	4	11.4	13	13.0
	5	6	9.2	2	5.7	8	8.0
	6	1	1.5	0	00.0	1	1.0
	7	3	4.6	3	8.6	6	6.0
	8	2	1.9	1	2.9	3	3.0
Total		65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	2.11						
Phi	0.15						

Freezer	1	10	15.4	6	17.1	16	16.0
	2	17	26.2	3	8.6	20	20.0
	3	13	20.0	4	11.4	17	17.0
	4	8	12.3	7	20.0	15	15.0
	5	7	10.8	5	14.3	12	12.0
	6	5	7.7	5	14.3	10	10.0
	7	3	4.6	1	8.6	6	6.0
	8	2	3.1	2	5.7	4	4.0
Total		65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0

chi^2 7.65
Phi 0.28

Table 15

Desirability of appliances in the home: Single mothers living in public and private housing compared, continued.

		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Appliance	Rank	n	%	n	%	n	%
Air Conditioner	1	10	15.6	2	6.1	12	12.4
	2	4	6.3	0	00.0	4	4.1
	3	8	12.5	1	3.0	9	9.3
	4	12	18.8	5	15.2	17	17.5
	5	6	9.4	5	15.2	11	11.3
	6	13	20.3	12	36.4	25	25.8
	7	9	14.1	5	15.2	14	14.4
	8	2	3.1	3	9.1	5	5.2
Total		64	66.0	33	34.0	97	100.0
chi^2		10.27					
Phi		0.33					
Humidifier	1	6	9.4	0	00.0	6	6.1
	2	6	9.4	5	14.3	11	11.1
	3	10	15.6	5	14.3	15	15.2
	4	9	14.1	2	5.7	11	11.1
	5	8	12.5	4	4.2	12	12.1
	6	5	7.8	4	11.4	9	9.1
	7	8	12.5	5	14.3	13	13.1
	8	12	18.8	10	28.6	22	22.2
Total		64	64.0	35	35.0	99	100.0
chi^2		6.60					
Phi		0.26					

Dishwasher	1	3	4.7	1	2.9	4	4.0
	2	2	3.1	2	5.7	4	4.0
	3	7	10.9	5	14.3	12	12.1
	4	8	12.5	4	11.4	12	12.1
	5	7	10.9	3	8.6	10	10.1
	6	7	10.9	4	11.4	11	11.1
	7	11	17.2	9	25.7	20	20.2
	8	19	29.7	7	20.0	26	26.3
Total		64	64.6	35	35.4	99	100.0

chi^2 2.55
Phi 0.16

Table 15

Desirability of appliances in the home: Single mothers living in public and private housing compared, continued.

		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Appliance	Rank	n	%	n	%	n	%
Microwave	1	3	4.7	0	00.0	3	3.0
	2	4	6.3	4	11.4	8	8.1
	3	7	10.9	7	20.0	14	14.1
	4	10	15.6	2	5.7	12	12.1
	5	10	15.6	6	17.1	16	16.2
	6	3	4.7	3	8.6	6	6.1
	7	18	28.1	6	17.1	24	24.2
	8	9	14.1	7	20.0	16	16.2
Total		64	64.6	35	35.4	99	100.0

chi^2 7.75
Phi 0.28

V.C.R.	1	1	1.6	0	00.0	1	1.0
	2	8	12.5	3	8.6	11	11.1
	3	3	4.7	4	11.4	7	7.1
	4	9	14.1	7	20.0	16	16.2
	5	15	23.4	7	20.0	22	22.2
	6	18	28.1	7	20.0	25	25.3
	7	4	6.3	4	11.4	8	8.1
	8	6	9.4	3	8.6	9	9.1
Total		64	64.6	35	35.4	99	100.0

chi^2 4.29
Phi 0.21

Table 16

Accessibility of essential services as a function of housing type (public vs.private).

		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Service		n	%	n	%	n	%
Dental	1	41	63.1	17	48.6	58	58.0
	2	13	20.0	7	20.0	20	20.0
	3	4	6.2	2	5.7	6	6.0
	4	5	7.7	5	14.3	10	10.0
	5	2	3.1	4	11.4	6	6.0
Total		65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2		4.47					
Phi		0.21					
Medical	1	45	69.2	24	68.6	69	69.0
	2	14	21.5	6	17.1	20	20.0
	3	1	1.5	2	1.0	3	3.0
	4	3	4.6	2	5.7	5	5.0
	5	2	3.1	1	2.9	3	3.0
Total		65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2		1.60					
Phi		0.13					
Legal	1	25	38.5	10	28.6	35	35.0
	2	18	27.7	8	22.9	26	26.0
	3	12	18.5	7	20.0	19	19.0
	4	3	4.6	4	11.4	7	7.0
	5	7	10.8	6	17.1	13	13.0
Total		65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2		3.09					
Phi		0.18					

1=very accessible; 2=somewhat accessible; 3=don't know; 4=somewhat inaccessible; 5=very inaccessible

Grocery	1	27	41.5	17	48.6	44	44.0
Shopping	2	13	20.0	8	22.9	21	21.0
	3	11	16.9	6	17.1	17	17.0
	4	14	21.5	4	11.4	18	18.0
Total		65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2		1.64					
Phi		0.13					

1=very convenient; 2=somewhat convenient; 3=somewhat inconvenient; 4=very inconvenient

Table 16

Accessibility of essential services as a function of housing type (public vs.private), continued.

		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Service		n	%	n	%	n	%
Satis-	1	15	23.1	8	22.9	23	23.0
faction	2	29	44.6	9	25.7	38	38.0
(legal,	3	6	9.2	4	11.4	10	10.0
medical,	4	9	13.8	10	28.6	19	19.0
dental)	5	6	9.2	4	11.4	10	10.0
Total		5	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2			4.96				
Phi		0.22					

1=extremely satisfied; 2=somewhat satisfied; 3=neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4=somewhat dissatisfied; 5=extremely dissatisfied

Table 17

Social support variables: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing.

Social Support Variables		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Counselling Involvement	Yes	29	46.8	21	61.8	50	52.1
	No	33	53.2	13	38.2	46	47.9
	Total	62	64.6	34	35.7	96	100.0
chi^2	1.98						
Phi	0.14						
Know Neighbours	Yes	53	81.5	26	74.3	79	79.0
	No	12	18.5	9	25.7	21	21.0
	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	0.72						
Phi	0.08						
Participate in Neighbourhood Watch	Yes	6	9.2	2	5.7	8	8.0
	No	59	90.8	33	94.3	92	92.0
	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	0.38						
Phi	0.06						
Would Participate in Neighbourhood Watch	Yes	49	81.7	30	85.7	79	83.2
	No	10	16.7	5	14.3	15	15.8
	Unsure	1	1.7	0	00.0	1	1.1
	Total	60	63.2	35	36.8	95	100.0
chi^2	0.71						
Phi	0.09						
Preferred Neighbourhood Grouping	Single Mothers	8	12.3	6	17.1	14	14.0
	Mixed Group	52	80.0	29	82.9	81	81.0
	Unsure	5	7.7	0	00.0	5	5.0
	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	3.10						
Phi	0.18						

Number of Friends	Not Enough	19	29.2	18	51.4	37	37.0
	Right Number	41	63.1	15	42.9	56	56.0
	Too Many	5	7.7	2	5.7	7	7.0
	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	4.82						
Phi	0.22						

Table 17

Social support variables: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing, combined.

Social Support Variables		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Enough time to spend with friends	Yes	29	44.6	10	28.6	39	39.0
	No	36	55.4	25	71.4	61	61.0
	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	2.46						
Phi	0.16						

Table 18

Social support variables: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse).

Social Support Variables		Lowrise		Highrise		Townhouse		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Counselling Involvement	Yes	6	40.0	13	48.1	8	47.1	27.1	45.8
	No	9	60.0	14	51.9	9	52.9	32	54.2
	Total	15	25.4	27	45.8	17	28.8	59	100.0
chi^2	0.27								
Phi	0.07								
Know Neighbours	Yes	13	86.7	23	76.7	16	94.1	52	83.9
	No	2	13.3	7	23.3	1	5.9	10	16.1
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	2.55								
Phi	0.20								
Participate in Neighbourhood Watch	Yes	1	6.7	2	6.7	2	11.8	5	8.1
	No	14	93.3	28	93.3	15	88.2	57	91.9
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	75	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	0.43								
Phi	0.08								
Would Participate in Neighhood Watch	Yes	10	71.4	23	79.3	14.	93.3	47	81.0
	No	4	28.6	6	20.7	0	00.0	10	17.2
	Unsure	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	6.7	1	1.7
	Total	14	24.1	29	50.0	15	25.9	58	100.0
chi^2	7.15								
Phi	0.35								
Preferred Neighbourhood Grouping	Single Mothers	2	13.3	4	13.3	1	5.9	7	11.3
	Mixed Group	12	80.0	23	76.7	15	88.2	50	80.6
	Unsure	1	6.7	3	10.0	1	5.9	5	8.1
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	1.06								
Phi	0.13								
Number of Friends	Not Enough	5	33.3	9	30.0	4	23.5	18	29.0
	Right Number	9	60.0	18	60.0	12	70.6	39	62.9
	Too Many	1	6.7	3	10.0	1	5.9	5	8.1
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	0.77								
Phi	0.11								

Table 18

Social support variables: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse, continued.

Social Support Variables		Lowrise		Highrise		Townhouse		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Enough time to spend with friends	Yes	7	46.7	14	46.7	6	35.3	27	43.5
	No	8	53.3	16	53.3	11	64.7	35	56.5
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0

chi^2	0.65
Phi	0.10

Table 19

Actual interior space configuration as a function of housing type (private vs. public). Multivariate and univariate analysis of variance procedures.

Actual Interior Space Variables	Public Housing			Private Housing			Total		
	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n
Number of Bedrooms	2.40	0.79	65	1.86	1.00	35	2.21	0.87	100
Multivariate F (2,97)		9.37***							
Univariate F(1,98)		8.89**							
Number of Rooms	4.63	1.22	65	4.17	1.72	35	4.47	1.42	100
F(1,98)		2.40							

***$p<.001$
** $p<.05$

Table 20

Actual interior space configuration as a function of housing type (private vs. public).

Actual Interior Space Variables		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
# Bedrooms	Yes	32	49.2	21	60.0	53	53.0
Adequate	No	33	50.8	43	40.0	47	47.0
	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	1.06						
Phi	0.10						
Separate	Yes	38	58.5	23	65.7	61	61.0
Kitchen/	No	27	41.5	12	34.3	39	39.0
Dining Room	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	0.50						
Phi	0.07						
Living	Separate	39	60.0	14	40.0	53	53.0
Room	Combined	26	40.0	21	60.0	47	47.0
	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	3.65						
Phi	0.19						
Adequate	Yes	26	40.0	14	40.0	40	40.0
Storage	No	39	60.0	21	60.0	60	60.0
Space							
	Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	0.00						
Phi	0.00						
Storage	Yes	26	40.0	17	50.0	43	43.4
Space	No	39	60.0	17	50.0	56	56.6
Elsewhere							
in Building							
	Total	65	65.7	34	34.3	99	100.0
chi^2	0.91						
Phi	0.10						

Table 21

Actual interior space configuration for mothers living in public housing as a function of housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse). Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance procedures.

Dependent Measures	Lowrise	Highrise	Townhouse	Total
Number of Children				
Mean	1.73	1.80	2.82	2.07
Standard deviation	0.88	0.76	1.13	1.01
n	15.00	30.00	17.00	62.00
Multivariate F	8.52 ***			
Degrees of freedom	(4,116)			
Univariate F	8.29 ***			
Degrees of freedom	(2,59)			
Number of Bedrooms				
Mean	2.33	2.03	3.18	2.42
Standard deviation	0.66	0.77	0.39	0.80
n	15.00	30.00	17.00	62.00
Multivariate F	8.52 ***			
Degrees of freedom	(4,116)			
Univariate F	17.06 ***			
Degrees of freedom	(2,59)			

Contrasts	Multivariate F	df	Univariate F	df
Number of Children				
1) Townhouse vs. Lowrise & Highrise	15.87***	2,58	16.31***	1,59
2) Lowrise vs. Highrise	1.46	2,58	0.05	1,59
Number of Bedrooms				
1) Townhouse vs. Lowrise & Highrise	15.87***	2,58	28.03***	1,59
2) Lowrise vs. Highrise	1.46	2,58	2.14	1,59

***p<.001

Table 22

Actual interior space configuration for mothers living in public housing as a function of housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse.)

Actual Interior Space Variables		Lowrise n	Lowrise %	Highrise n	Highrise %	Townhouse n	Townhouse %	Total n	Total %
# Bedrooms Adequate	Yes	10	66.7	10	33.3	11	64.7	31	50.0
	No	5	33.3	20	66.7	6	35.3	31	50.0
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	6.47*								
Phi	0.32*								
Separate Kitchen/ Dining Room	Yes	8	53.3	19	63.3	10	58.8	37	59.7
	No	7	46.7	11	36.7	7	41.2	25	40.3
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	0.42								
Phi	0.08								
Living Room	Separate	8	53.3	17	56.7	13	76.5	38	61.3
	Combined	7	46.7	13	43.3	4	23.5	24	38.7
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	2.32								
Phi	0.19								
Adequate Storage Space	Yes	8	53.3	10	33.3	8	47.1	26	41.9
	No	7	46.7	20	66.7	9	52.9	36	58.1
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	1.90								
Phi	0.17								
Storage Space Elsewhere in Building	Yes	7	46.7	16	53.3	2	11.8	25	40.3
	No	8	53.3	14	46.7	15	88.2	37	59.7
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	8.12*								
Phi	0.36*								

*$p<.05$

Table 23

Projected interior space configuration for mothers living in public and private housing compared.

Projected Interior Space Variables		Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
1 Bedrooms smaller, but more of them		8	12.3	10	29.4	18	18.2
or Larger kitchen & smaller living room		20	30.8	5	14.7	25	25.3
or Neither		37	56.9	19	55.9	56	56.6
Total		65	65.7	34	34.4	99	100.0
chi^2	5.88*						
Phi	0.24*						
2 Smaller bedrooms, larger living room	Yes	14	21.5	9	26.5	23	23.2
	No	51	78.5	25	73.3	76	76.8
	Total	65	65.7	34	34.3	99	100.0
chi^2	0.30						
Phi	0.06						
3 Larger kitchen, smaller living room	Yes	19	29.2	7	20.6	26	26.3
	No	46	70.8	27	79.4	73	73.7
	Total	65	65.7	34	34.3	99	100.0
chi^2	0.86						
Phi	0.09						
4 Larger kitchen, smaller bedroom	Yes	15	23.1	4	11.8	19	19.2
	No	50	76.9	30	88.2	80	80.8
	Total	65	65.7	34	34.3	99	100.0
chi^2	1.84						
Phi	0.14						
5 Larger bedroom, smaller living room	Yes	20	30.8	10	29.4	30	30.3
	No	45	69.2	24	70.6	69	69.7
	Total	65	65.7	34	34.3	99	100.0
chi^2	0.02						
Phi	0.01						

Table 23

Projected interior space configuration for mothers living in public and private housing compared, continued.

Projected Interior Space Variables		Public Housing n	Public Housing %	Private Housing n	Private Housing %	Total n	Total %
6 Extra bathroom, smaller other rooms	Yes	20	30.8	11	32.4	31	31.3
	No	45	69.2	23	67.6	68	68.7
	Total	65	65.7	34	34.3	99	100.0
chi^2	0.03						
Phi	0.02						
7 Shower & sink, separate from toilet	Yes	20	30.8	9	26.5	29	29.3
	No	45	69.2	25	73.5	70	70.7
	Total	65	65.7	34	34.3	99	100.0
chi^2	0.20						
Phi	0.04						
8 Smaller bedrooms, but more	Yes	20	30.8	15	44.1	35	35.4
	No	45	69.2	19	55.9	64	64.6
	Total	65	65.7	34	34.3	99	100.0
chi^2	1.74						
Phi	0.13						

$*p<.05$

Table 24

Projected interior space configuration for mothers living in public housing as a function of housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse.)

Projected Interior Space Variables		Lowrise		Highrise		Townhouse		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1 Bedrooms smaller, but more of them or		1	6.7	6	20.0	1	12.5	8	12.9
Larger kitchen & smaller living room or		5	33.3	7	23.3	6	35.3	18	29.0
Neither		9	60.0	17	56.7	10	58.8	36	58.1
Total		15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	2.95								
Phi	0.22								
2 Smaller bedrooms, larger living room	Yes	3	20.0	8	26.7	2	11.8	13	21.0
	No	12	80.0	22	73.3	15	88.2	49	79.0
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	1.47								
Phi	0.15								
3 Larger kitchen, smaller living room	Yes	4	26.7	6	20.0	8	47.1	18	29.0
	No	11	73.3	24	80.0	9	52.9	44	71.0
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	3.91								
Phi	0.25								
4 Larger kitchen, smaller bedroom	Yes	5	33.3	5	16.7	5	29.4	15	22.4
	No	10	66.7	25	83.3	12	70.6	47	75.8
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	1.86								
Phi	0.17								
5 Larger bedroom, smaller living room	Yes	4	26.7	10	33.3	6	35.3	20	32.2
	No	11	73.3	20	66.7	11	64.7	42	67.7
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	0.30								
Phi	0.07								

Table 24

Projected interior space configuration for mothers living in public housing as a function of housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse.), continued.

Projected Interior Space Variables		Lowrise		Highrise		Townhouse		Total	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
6 Extra bathroom, smaller other rooms	Yes	2	13.0	11	36.7	6	35.3	19	30.6
	No	13	86.7	19	63.3	11	64.7	43	69.4
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	2.80								
Phi	0.21								
7 Shower & sink, separate from toilet	Yes	4	26.7	10	33.3	6	35.3	20	32.3
	No	11	73.3	20	66.7	11	64.7	42	67.7
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	0.30								
Phi	0.07								
8 Smaller bedrooms, but more of them	Yes	4	26.7	9	30.0	5	29.4	18	29.0
	No	11	73.3	21	70.0	12	70.6	44	71.0
	Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	0.06								
Phi	0.03								

Table 25

Single mothers' ratings of lighting adequacy in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing.

Is the lighting adequate in:

1. Hallways

Housing Type	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public Housing	45	84.9	8	7.1	53	70.7
Private Housing	20	90.9	2	9.0	22	29.3
Total	65	86.7	10	13.3	75	100.0
chi^2	0.48					
Phi	0.08					

2. Stairwells

Housing Type	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public Housing	41	77.4	10	18.9	2	3.8	53	70.7
Private Housing	20	90.9	1	4.5	1	4.5	22	29.3
Total	61	81.3	11	14.7	3	4.0	75	100.0
chi^2	2.55							
Phi	0.18							

3. Lobby

Housing Type	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public Housing	42	89.4	5	10.6	47	69.1
Private Housing	19	90.5	2	9.5	21	30.9
Total	61	89.7	7	10.3	68	100.0
chi^2	0.02					
Phi	0.02					

4. Elevators

Housing Type	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public Housing	27	79.4	6	17.6	1	7.1	34	70.8
Private Housing	13	92.9	1	7.1	0	00.0	14	29.2
Total	40	83.3	71	14.6	1	2.1	48	100.0
chi^2	1.38							
Phi	0.17							

5. Parking Areas

	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public Housing	32	42.2	32	50.0	5	4.2	64	70.3
Private Housing	13	48.1	13	48.1	1	3.7	27	29.7
Total	40	44.0	45	49.5	6	6.6	91	100.0
chi^2	0.65							
Phi	0.08							

Table 25

Single mothers' ratings of lighting adequacy in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing, continued.

Housing Type	6. Laundry Rooms							
	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public Housing	46	93.9	3	6.1	0	00.0	49	72.1
Private Housing	16	84.2	1	5.3	2	10.5	19	27.9
Total	62	91.2	4	5.9	2	2.9	68	100.0
chi^2	5.31							
Phi	0.28							

	7. Outdoor Paths							
	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public Housing	27	42.2	36	56.3	1	1.6	64	66.7
Private Housing	22	68.8	10	31.3	0	00.0	32	33.3
Total	49	51.0	46	47.9	1	1.0	96	100.0
chi^2	6.23							
Phi	0.25							

*$p<.05$

Table 26

Single mothers' ratings of lighting adequacy in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in private housing by housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse).

Is the lighting adequate in:

Housing Type	1. Hallways					
	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	12	80.0	3	20.0	15	29.4
Highrise	26	86.7	4	13.3	30	58.8
Townhouse	5	83.3	1	16.7	6	11.8
Total	43	84.3	8	15.7	51	100.0
chi^2	0.34					
Phi	0.08					

	2. Stairwells							
	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	13	86.7	2	13.3	0	00.0	15	29.4
Highrise	22	73.3	6	20.0	2	6.7	30	58.8
Townhouse	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	00.0	6	11.8
Total	39	76.5	10	19.6	2	3.9	51	100.0
chi^2	2.60							
Phi	0.23							

	3. Lobby					
	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	10	83.3	2	16.7	12	26.1
Highrise	28	93.3	3	75.0	41	89.1
Townhouse	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	8.7
Total	41	89.1	5	10.9	46	100.0
chi^2	1.79					
Phi	0.20					

	4. Elevators							
	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	4	100.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	4	11.8
Highrise	23	76.7	6	20.0	1	3.3	30	88.2
Townhouse	00	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0	0	00.0
Total	27	79.4	6	17.6	1	2.9	34	100.0
chi^2	1.18							
Phi	0.19							

Table 26

Single mothers' ratings of lighting adequacy in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in private housing by housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse), continued.

Is the lighting adequate in:

5. Parking Areas

	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	6	40.0	9	60.0	0	00.0	15	24.6
Highrise	9	31.0	15	51.7	5	17.2	29	47.5
Townhouse	10	58.8	7	41.2	0	00.0	17	27.9
Total	25	41.0	31	50.8	5	8.2	61	100.0
chi^2	1.18							
Phi	0.19							

6. Laundry Rooms

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	12	85.7	2	14.3	14	29.8
Highrise	29	96.7	1	3.3	30	63.8
Townhouse	3	100.0	0	00.0	3	6.4
Total	44	93.6	3	6.4	47	100.0
chi^2	2.13					
Phi	0.21					

7. Outdoor Paths

	Yes		No		Don't Know		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	5	33.3	10	66.7	0	00.0	4	24.6
Highrise	16	53.3	13	43.3	1	3.3	30	49.2
Townhouse	5	31.3	11	68.8	0	00.0	16	26.2
Total	26	42.6	34	55.7	1	1.6	61	100.0
chi^2	4.27							
Phi	0.26							

Table 27

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing.

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Building		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Public	1.Extremely Afraid	8	12.3	65	
65.7					
Housing	2.Somewhat Afraid	26	40.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	11	16.9		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	14	21.5		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	6	9.2		
Private	1.Extremely Afraid	1	2.9	34	
34.3					
Housing	2.Somewhat Afraid	8	23.5		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	7	20.6		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	10	29.4		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	8	23.5		
Total	1.Extremely Afraid	9	9.1	99	
100.0					
	2.Somewhat Afraid	34	34.3		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	18	18.2		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	24	24.2		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	14	14.1		

chi^2	7.88
Phi	0.28

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Hallways		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Public	1.Extremely Afraid	4	7.5	53	
70.7					
Housing	2.Somewhat Afraid	22	41.5		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	12	22.6		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	10	18.9		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	5	9.4		
Private	1.Extremely Afraid	0	00.0	22	
29.3					
Housing	2.Somewhat Afraid	4	18.2		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	4	18.2		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	8	36.4		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	6	27.3		

Total	1.Extremely Afraid	4	5.3	75
100.0				
	2.Somewhat Afraid	26	34.7	
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	16	21.3	
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	18	24.0	
	5.Extremely Relaxed	11	14.7	
chi^2	9.60*			
Phi	0.36*			

Table 27

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing, continued.

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Apartment n	Apartment %	Total n	Total %
Public Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	4	6.3	64	65.3
	2.Somewhat Afraid	27	42.2		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	8	12.5		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	13	20.3		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	12	18.8		
Private Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	0	00.0	34	34.7
	2.Somewhat Afraid	10	29.4		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	7	20.6		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	6	17.6		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	11	32.4		
Total	1.Extremely Afraid	4	4.1	98	100.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	37	37.8		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	15	15.3		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	19	19.4		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	23	23.5		
chi^2	5.87				
Phi	0.24				

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Elevators n	Elevators %	Total n	Total %
Private Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	9	26.5	34	70.8
	2.Somewhat Afraid	17	50.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	3	8.8		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	4	11.8		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	1	2.9		
Public Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	1	7.1	14	29.2
	2.Somewhat Afraid	5	35.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	2	14.3		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	6	42.9		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	0	00.0		

Total	1.Extremely Afraid	10	20.8	48	100.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	22	45.8		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	5	10.4		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	10	20.8		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	1	2.1		

chi^2	7.52
Phi	0.40

Table 27

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing, continued.

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Laundry Room		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Public Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	8	17.4	46	73.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	18	39.1		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	8	17.4		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	7	15.2		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	5	10.9		
Private Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	0	00.0	17	27.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	4	23.5		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	3	17.6		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	7	41.2		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	3	17.6		
Total	1.Extremely Afraid	8	12.7	63	100.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	22	34.9		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	11	17.5		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	14	22.2		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	8	12.7		
chi^2	8.03				
Phi	0.36				

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Stairwells		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Public Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	15	30.6	49	68.1
	2.Somewhat Afraid	16	32.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	8	16.3		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	6	12.2		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	4	8.2		
Private Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	1	4.3	23	31.9
	2.Somewhat Afraid	7	30.4		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	3	13.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	6	26.1		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	6	26.1		

Total 100.0	1.Extremely Afraid	16	22.2	72
	2.Somewhat Afraid	23	31.9	
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	11	15.3	
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	12	16.7	
	5.Extremely Relaxed	10	13.9	
chi^2	10.41*			
Phi	0.38*			

Table 27

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing, continued.

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Outside Areas		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Public Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	14	21.5	65	65.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	31	47.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	8	12.3		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	9	13.8		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	3	4.6		
Private Housing	1.Extremely Afraid	2	5.7	35	35.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	20	57.1		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	4	11.4		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	3	8.6		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	6	17.1		
Total	1.Extremely Afraid	16	16.0	100	100.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	51	51.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	12	12.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	12	12.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	9	9.0		
chi^2	8.47				
Phi	0.29				

Table 28

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type: lowrise, highrise, townhouse

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Building n	Building %	Total n	Total %
Lowrise	1.Extremely Afraid	4	26.7	15	24.2
	2.Somewhat Afraid	4	26.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	3	20.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	1	6.7		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	3	20.0		
Highrise	1.Extremely Afraid	3	10.0	30	48.4
	2.Somewhat Afraid	15	50.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	4	13.3		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	6	20.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	2	6.7		
Townhouse	1.Extremely Afraid	1	5.9	17	27.4
	2.Somewhat Afraid	4	23.5		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	4	23.5		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	7	41.2		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	1	5.9		
Total	1.Extremely Afraid	8	12.9	62	100.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	23	37.1		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	11	17.1		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	14	22.6		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	6	9.7		

chi^2 12.93
Phi 0.46

Table 28

**Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations:
A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type:
lowrise, highrise, townhouse, continued.**

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Apartment		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Lowrise 24.6	1.Extremely Afraid	2	13.3	15	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	5	33.3		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	2	13.3		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	3	20.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	3	20.0		
Highrise 49.2	1.Extremely Afraid	1	3.3	30	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	14	46.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	4	13.3		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	3	10.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	8	26.7		
Townhouse 26.2	1.Extremely Afraid	1	6.3	16	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	5	31.3		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	2	12.5		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	7	43.8		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	1	6.3		
Total 100.0	1.Extremely Afraid	4	6.6	61	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	24	39.3		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	8	13.1		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	13	21.3		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	12	19.7		
chi^2	10.15				
Phi	0.41				

Table 28

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type:
lowrise, highrise, townhouse, continued.

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Elevators		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Lowrise 11.8	1.Extremely Afraid	0	00.0	4	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	3	75.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	1	25.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	0	00.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	0	00.0		
Highrise 88.2	1.Extremely Afraid	9	30.0	30	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	14	46.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	2	6.7		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	4	13.3		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	1	3.3		
Townhouse 00.0	1.Extremely Afraid	0	00.0	00	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	0	00.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	0	00.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	0	00.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	0	00.0		
Total 100.0	1.Extremely Afraid	9	26.5	34	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	17	50.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	3	8.8		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	4	11.8		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	1	2.9		
chi^2	3.78				
Phi	0.33				

Table 28

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type: lowrise, highrise, townhouse, continued

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Laundry Room		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Lowrise 29.5	1.Extremely Afraid	3	23.1	13	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	3	23.3		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	1	7.7		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	4	30.8		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	2	15.4		
Highrise 58.8	1.Extremely Afraid	5	17.2	30	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	13	44.8		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	5	17.2		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	3	10.3		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	3	10.3		
Townhouse 4.5	1.Extremely Afraid	0	00.0	2	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	0	00.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	2	100.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	0	00.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	0	00.0		
Total 100.0	1.Extremely Afraid	8	18.2	44	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	16	36.4		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	8	18.2		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	7	15.9		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	5	11.4		

chi^2 13.77
Phi 0.56

Table 28

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type: lowrise, highrise, townhouse, continued

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Hallways		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Lowrise	1.Extremely Afraid	1	6.7	15	29.4
	2.Somewhat Afraid	6	40.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	3	20.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	4	26.7		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	1	6.7		
Highrise	1.Extremely Afraid	3	10.0	30	58.8
	2.Somewhat Afraid	11	36.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	6	20.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	6	20.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	4	13.3		
Townhouse	1.Extremely Afraid	0	00.0	6	11.8
	2.Somewhat Afraid	3	50.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	3	50.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	0	00.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	0	00.0		
Total	1.Extremely Afraid	4	7.8	51	100.0
	2.Somewhat Afraid	20	39.2		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	12	23.5		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	10	19.6		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	5	9.8		
chi^2	5.61				
Phi	0.33				

Table 28

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type: lowrise, highrise, townhouse, continued

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Stairwells		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Lowrise 31.9	1.Extremely Afraid	2	13.3	15	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	4	26.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	3	20.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	4	26.7		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	2	13.3		
Highrise 61.7	1.Extremely Afraid	12	41.4	29	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	9	31.0		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	4	13.8		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	2	6.9		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	2	6.9		
Townhouse 6.4	1.Extremely Afraid	0	00.0	3	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	2	66.7		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	1	33.3		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	0	00.0		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	0	00.0		
Total 100.0	1.Extremely Afraid	14	29.8	47	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	15	31.9		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	8	17.0		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	6	12.8		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	4	8.5		
chi^2	9.75				
Phi	0.46				

Table 28

Single mothers' ratings of fear in various building locations: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type: lowrise, highrise, townhouse, continued.

Housing Type	Fear Ratings	Outside Areas		Total	
		n	%	n	%
Lowrise 24.2	1.Extremely Afraid	3	20.0	15	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	8	53.3		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	1	6.7		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	1	6.7		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	2	13.3		
Highrise 48.4	1.Extremely Afraid	7	23.3	30	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	13	43.3		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	5	16.7		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	4	13.3		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	1	3.3		
Townhouse 27.4	1.Extremely Afraid	4	23.5	17	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	8	47.1		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	2	11.8		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	3	17.6		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	0	00.0		
Total 100.0	1.Extremely Afraid	14	22.6	62	
	2.Somewhat Afraid	29	46.8		
	3.Not Afraid/Relaxed	8	12.9		
	4.Somewhat Relaxed	8	12.9		
	5.Extremely Relaxed	3	4.8		
chi^2	5.02				
Phi	0.28				

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .001$

Table 29

Theft/vandalism, security and satisfaction with policing of housing complex: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing.

Housing Type Items

1. Problems with Vandalism in Building

Housing Type	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Total n	Total %
Public	42	64.6	23	35.4	65	65.0
Private	11	31.4	24	68.6	35	35.0
Total	53	53.0	47	47.0	100	100.0
chi^2	10.06**					
Phi	0.32**					

2. Theft/Vandalism Concern

Housing Type	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Total n	Total %
Public	45	69.2	20	30.8	65	65.0
Private	15	42.9	20	57.1	35	35.0
Total	60	60.0	40	40.0	100	100.0
chi^2	6.59**					
Phi	0.26**					

3. Apartment Broken Into

Housing Type	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Total n	Total %
Public	8	12.3	57	87.7	65	65.0
Private	4	11.4	31	88.6	35	35.0
Total	12	12.0	88	88.0	100	100.0
chi^2	0.02					
Phi	0.01					

4. Anything Stolen from Family

Housing Type	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Total n	Total %
Public	28	43.1	37	56.9	65	65.0
Private	10	28.6	25	71.4	35	35.0
Total	38	38.0	62	62.0	100	100.0
chi^2	2.03					
Phi	0.14					

5. Building live in is Secure

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	15	23.8	48	76.2	63	64.3
Private	18	51.4	17	48.6	35	35.7
Total	33	33.7	65	66.3	98	100.0
chi^2	7.68**					
Phi	0.28**					

Table 29

Theft/vandalism, security and satisfaction with policing of housing complex: A comparison of mothers living in public and private housing, continued.

6. Locks on apartment doors secure

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Public	41	63.1	24	36.9	65	66.3
Private	16	48.5	17	51.5	33	33.7
Total	57	58.2	41	41.8	98	100.0
chi^2	1.92					
Phi	0.14					

7. Satisfaction with Policing of Housing Complex

	Extremely Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Neither		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Extremely Dissatisfied		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Pub.	3	4.6	27	41.5	3	4.6	15	23.1	17	26.2	65	65.7
Pri.	8	23.5	5	14.7	9	26.5	3	8.8	9	26.5	34	34.3
Tot.	11	11.1	32	32.3	12	12.1	18	18.2	26	26.3	99	100.0
chi^2			23.45***									
Phi			0.49***									

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Table 30

Theft/vandalism, security and satisfaction with policing of housing complex: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse).

Housing Type	Items					
	1. Problems with Vandalism in Building					
	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	12	80.0	3	20.0	15	24.2
Highrise	25	83.3	5	10.2	30	48.4
Townhouse	4	23.5	13	76.5	17	27.4
Total	41	66.1	21	33.9	62	100.0
chi^2	19.03**					
Phi	0.55**					
	2. Theft/Vandalism Concern					
	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	9	60.0	6	40.0	15	24.2
Highrise	20	66.7	10	33.3	30	48.4
Townhouse	14	82.4	3	17.6	17	27.4
Total	43	69.4	19	30.6	62	100.0
chi^2	2.07					
Phi	0.18					
	3. Apartment Broken Into					
	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	2	13.3	13	86.7	15	24.2
Highrise	3	10.0	27	90.0	30	48.4
Townhouse	3	17.6	14	82.4	17	27.4
Total	8	12.9	54	87.1	62	100.0
chi^2	0.57					
Phi	0.10					
	4. Anything Stolen from Family					
	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	6	40.0	9	60.0	15	24.2

Highrise	11	36.7	19	63.3	30	48.4
Townhouse	10	58.8	7	41.2	17	27.4
Total	27	43.5	35	56.5	62	100.0
chi^2	2.27					
Phi	0.19					

Table 30

Theft/vandalism, security and satisfaction with policing of housing complex: A comparison of mothers living in public housing by housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse), continued.

5. Building live in is secure

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	7	46.7	8	53.3	53	24.2
Highrise	21	70.0	9	30.0	30	48.4
Townhouse	11	64.7	6	35.3	17	27.4
Total	39	62.9	23	37.1	62	100.0

chi^2 2.37
Phi 0.20

6. Locks on apartment doors secure

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Lowrise	3	20.0	12	80.0	15	25.0
Highrise	6	20.0	24	80.0	30	50.0
Townhouse	6	40.0	9	60.0	15	25.0
Total	15	25.0	45	75.0	60	100.0

chi^2 2.40
Phi 0.20

7. Satisfaction with Policing of Housing Complex

	Extremely Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Neither		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Extremely Dissatisfied		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
L.R.	1	6.7	5	33.3	0	00.0	2	13.3	7	46.7	15	24.2
H.R.	2	6.7	10	33.3	3	10.0	8	26.7	7	23.3	30	48.4
T.H.	0	00.0	10	58.8	0	00.0	4	28.6	3	17.6	17	27.4
Tot.	3	4.8	25	40.3	3	4.8	14	22.6	17	27.4	62	100.0

chi^2	9.91
Phi	.40

*** $p < .001$

Table 31

Single mothers' responses to drug/alcohol items as a function of residency type (public vs. private).

	Public Housing		Private Housing		Total	
Items	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Drugs/ alcohol problem in building or grounds.						
Considerable Problem	42	64.6	7	20.0	49	49.0
Somewhat a Problem	13	20.0	8	22.9	21	21.0
Minor Problem	3	4.6	7	20.0	10	10.0
No Problem	2	3.1	8	22.9	10	10.0
Don't Know	5	7.7	5	14.3	10	10.0
Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	24.60***					
Phi	0.50***					
2. Concern child may have access to drugs/ alcohol in building or grounds.						
Very concerned	33	50.8	10	28.6	43	43.0
Somewhat concerned	15	23.1	10	28.6	25	25.0
Not at all concerned	17	26.2	12	34.3	29	29.0
Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0
chi^2	8.97*					
Phi	0.30*					
3. Availability of drugs/alcohol in building/grounds.						

Very available	46	70.8	10	28.6	56	56.0
Somewhat available	4	6.2	7	20.0	11	11.0
Don't know	13	20.0	16	45.7	29	29.0
Hard to obtain	1	1.5	0	00.0	1	1.0
Extremely hard to obtain	1	1.5	2	5.7	3	3.0
Total	65	65.0	35	35.0	100	100.0

chi^2	18.25***
Phi	0.43***

***$p<.001$
**$p<.05$

Table 32

Responses of single mothers' living in public housing to drug/alcohol items as a function of housing type (lowrise, highrise, townhouse).

Items	Lowrise n	Lowrise %	Highrise n	Highrise %	Townhouse n	Townhouse %	Total n	Total %
1. Drugs/ alcohol problem in building or grounds.								
Considerable Problem	10	66.7	22	73.3	8	47.1	40	64.5
Somewhat a Problem	2	13.3	5	16.7	5	29.4	12	19.4
Minor Problem	1	6.7	1	3.3	1	5.9	3	4.8
No Problem	1	6.7	0	00.0	1	5.9	2	3.2
Don't Know	1	6.7	2	6.7	2	11.8	17	27.4
Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	5.03							
Phi	0.28							
2. Concern child may have access to drugs/ alcohol in building or grounds.								
Very concerned	8	53.3	18	60.0	6	35.3	32	51.6
Somewhat concerned	1	6.7	6	20.0	7	41.2	14	22.6
Not at all concerned	6	40.0	6	20.0	4	23.5	16	25.8
Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	7.23							
Phi	0.34							

3. Availability of drugs/alcohol in building/grounds.

Very available	10	66.7	23	76.7	11	64.7	44	71.0
Somewhat available	0	00.0	4	13.3	0	00.0	4	6.5
Don't know	5	33.3	2	6.7	5	29.4	12	19.4
Hard to obtain	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	5.9	1	1.6
Extremely hard to obtain	0	00.0	1	3.3	0	00.0	1	1.6
Total	15	24.2	30	48.4	17	27.4	62	100.0
chi^2	13.15							
Phi	0.46							

$***p<.001$
$**p<.05$

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Background Questionnaire

Please check the appropriate answer. If there are any questions you are not comfortable answering, leave them blank. Your name will not appear in the research and this material will not be shown to anyone other than research staff connected with this project. Your cooperation is most appreciated.

Are you:

Single (unmarried)_____
Separated _____________
Divorced ______________
Widowed _______________

Age: 15-19____ 20-24____25-30____ over 30____

Were you born in Canada? Yes____ No____
If not, in what year did you come to Canada?______
In what country were you born?____________________

How many children do you have living with you?________

List the sex and age of your children:
1.___________________
2.___________________
3.___________________
4.___________________
5.___________________

Are you employed at the moment?
Employed full-time_______
Employed part-time_______
Laid off_________________
Maternity leave__________
Disablility_______________
Not working outside my home now___________

Occupation (if employed) ______________________
(outside your home)

If not employed outside your home, would you like to be employed outside your home?:
Full-time___
Part-time___
Not at all__

Specify why?___________________________

What form of governmental assistance do you receive?

Mother's allowance____
Welfare_______________
Unemployment insurance_________
Student loans or grants__________
Other _______ Specify_________________
None _______

Do you receive financial help from any other sources?__________

If yes, from what sources?____________________________________

Annual income (approximate): under $10,000_______
$10,000-15,000______
$15,001-20,000______
$20,001-25,000______
$25,001-30,000______
over $30,000________

Approximately how much of your income is spent on housing?___________

What is the highest grade or level of school that you completed?
_______ grade

Did you graduate high school? Yes____No____

Did you attend a community college or university? Yes___ No____
Do you have a university degree or other certification? Yes___ No___

Are you currently attending school or taking any courses or training programme? Yes ___ No ___ Specify_________________

Interview Questions

Where do your children spend their days? (for each child) and how much time (in hours) is spent?

Child #(identify)	Child#(identify)
Home_________	Home_______
School_______	School_____
Daycare______	Daycare____
Friend_______	Friend_____
Neighbour____	Neighbour__
Family_______	Family_____
Other (specify)____	Other (specify)_____

Do you ever find it difficult to find someone to take care of your child (children)?
Often_________
Sometimes_____
Rarely_________

If you need to go out in the evenings or on weekends, who usually takes care of the children?
Family_________
Friend_________
Neighbour_____
Babysitter (unrelated)______
Older Child____________
Other (specify)________
No one_____

Do you use a daycare centre at all?
Yes___
No____

Where is it located?
In the building____
In another building_____ How far away___

Is it profit/nonprofit?
Yes____
No_____
Don't know____

Do you have to put in your own time working in the daycare centre?
Yes____
No_____
Don't know____

Does the daycare centre you are presently using have flexible hours? (other than 9-5)
Yes___
No____
Don't know___

If daycare services were available in the evenings and on the weekends, how often would you use them?
Frequently_______

Occasionally_____
Rarely__________

Are you satisfied with your present
day care arrangements ________ ________

Which type of daycare would you prefer?
____ Co-op (mothers volunteer to staff, cheaper)
____ Professional (staff with ECE, expensive, less flexible hours

If co-op daycare was made available in your building, would you be willing to volunteer? Yes___
No___
Don't know___

If any of your children attend school, is anyone at home when they come home from school? Yes____
No____

Where do your children play when indoors? ________________

How much time is spent in indoor play? ___________________

Where do your children go to play outside? _______________

How much time is spent in outdoor play?_______(in hours)

Are you ever afraid of having your child play outdoors in unsupervised areas? Constantly______
Often_________
Sometimes_______
Never_______

What do you fear about your child's unsupervised outdoor play?____

Has any incident ever occurred?___If so, what________________

Are you satisfied with play areas available for your children?
Yes___
No____

What would you like to see changed?___ ______________________

What do you like about the play areas available for your children? ____

What equipment is in the play area?___________________________

Is there any place you like to walk with your children to (park, neighbourhood centre, etc.). Where?

What sort of after-school activities are available for your child(ren).
Music lessons_____
Ballet lessons____
Swimming________
Self-defense lessons____
Skating_____
Hockey_______
Other________
None_________

How much time is spent this way every week?_________

If you could afford after-school activities for your children what sorts of things would you prefer? ______________________

What arrangements are made for professional development days when your child(ren) do not attend school?__________________________

What arrangements are made for days when your children are sick and cannot attend school?______________________________________

When school is out for the summer what sort of things do you and your children do?____

If summer play activities/classes were available would you or your children use them?____

Are there any places of worship (churches)/religious facilities in your neighbourhood?
Yes___
No____

Do you make use of them?
Yes___
No____

How often?____

Do you have access to a car for transportation?
Yes___
No____

If you have a car do you have access to adequate parking?
Yes___
No____

How do you travel back and forth to work (or school, errands, etc.)
Car (alone)____
Car (with others)_____
Bus______
Subway___
Combination_____
Bicycle_________
Walk____________

Other (specify)____

Do you have trouble getting places because of transportation problems? Constantly_____
Often__________
Sometimes______
Never___________

Approximately how much time do you spend travelling each day?_______

What type of hours do you work or go to school? Regular_____
Irregular___
Shift work__

How often do you go grocery shopping?_____

How convenient is it to go grocery shopping? Very convenient____
Somewhat convenient________
Somewhat inconvenient______
Very inconvenient__________

Would you like to have evening courses offered in the building you live in? Yes___
No___
Don't know___

If yes, which of the following would you be interested in attending? Money management_____
Diet and nutrition___
Child health_________
Parenting____________
Educational/Academic upgrading______
Non-traditional skills e.g. Home repair, Woodworking, Upholstery______
English lessons________
Other______

Can you think of any other services you would like to have available in your building?

Tuck shop/convenience store	Yes___	No___
Cleaners	Yes___	No___
Health services	Yes___	No___
Social welfare agencies	Yes___	No___
Lending library	Yes___	No___
Toy exchange	Yes___	No___
Automated teller	Yes___	No___

Do you rent or own your own home? Rent____
Own_____

Is your housing subsidized? Yes___
No____
Don't know___

Did you have any trouble finding a place to live? Yes___
No____

If you are a single parent have you ever felt you were discriminated against when looking for housing because you were a single mother?

Yes___
No____
Don't
know___

Who is responsible for the maintenance of your home?_________

Have you had any problems with this method of maintenance?
Yes____
No_____

Are you satisfied with the cleanliness, level of maintenance of the streets, walkways, parks, playgrounds, etc.
Yes___
No____

Do you have any problems with vandalism in your building?
Yes___
No____

Has your apartment been broken into? Yes___
No____

Has anyone stolen anything form you or your family? Yes___ No___
(e.g. bikes, laundry room,)

What was taken?_________________________
From where?_____________________________

Is this a concern of yours? Yes___
No____

Is the lighting adequate in hallways Yes___ No___
stairwells Yes___ No___
lobby Yes___ No___

elevators Yes___ No___
parking areas Yes___ No___
laundry rooms Yes___ No___
outdoor paths Yes___ No___

In your building, do you feel
1 .extremely afraid
2. somewhat afraid
3. not afraid or relaxed
4. somewhat relaxed
5. extremely relaxed
In these areas:_____your apartment
_____the elevators
_____the laundry room
_____hallways
_____stairwells
_____outside areas

Are drugs/alcohol a problem in your building or grounds?

_____Considerable problem
____ Somewhat a problem
____ Minor problem
____ No problem
_____Don’t know

Are you concerned that your child may have access to drugs/alcohol in the building/grounds?

_____Very concerned
_____Somewhat concerned
_____Not at all concerned
_____Don’t know

How available are drugs in your building/grounds?

____ Very available
____ Somewhat available
____ Don’t know
____ Hard to obtain
____ Extremely hard to obtain

How satisfied are you with the policing of the housing complex?

____ Extremely satisfied
____ Somewhat satisfied
____ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
____ Somewhat dissatisfied
____ Extremely dissatisfied

Have you or your children ever had trouble with the police?
Yes____
No_____

Do you avoid calling the police because you are afraid of them?
Yes___
No____

Have you ever consulted a lawyer? Yes___
No____

How accessible are legal services, community legal clinics, etc. to you?
_____very accessible
_____somewhat accessible
_____don't know
_____somewhat inaccessible
_____very inaccessible

How accessible are medical services/health care to you and your child(ren)?
_____very accessible
_____somewhat accessible
_____don't know
_____somewhat inaccessible
_____very inaccessible

Do you go to a
_____private physician's office
_____hospital clinic
_____community clinic
_____other (specify)_______

How accessible are dental services to you and your child(ren)?
____very accessible
_____somewhat accessible
_____don't know
_____somewhat inaccessible
_____very inaccessible

Are you satisfied with these arrangements or would you like changes made?
____ Extremely satisfied
____ Somewhat satisfied
____ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
____ Somewhat dissatisfied
____ Extremely dissatisfied

Would you prefer to live in an area with other single mothers or with a more mixed group?
Single mothers___
Mixed group______

Do you feel you have
____ not enough
____ just the right number of friends

____ too many

Do you feel you have enough time to spend with friends?
Yes___
No____

Where do you do your laundry? Basement laundry room____
Apartment_____
Laundromat____

Which would you prefer, using a common of a laundry room or the convenience of having a washer and dryer in your own apartment?
Laundry room____________
Own washer/dryer_________

What appliances would you like to have in your home? Which one would be the most important? Please rank order

________ V.C.R.
________ Freezer
________ Dishwasher
________ Microwave oven
________ Air conditioning
________ Humidifier
________ Washer/dryer
________ Television

Are there any activities you have difficulty with as a single parent?____

How could these activities be made easier?____________________
____

Would low-cost restaurants/fast food outlets/take-outs located near the building be desirable?
Yes___
No___

What type of housing do you presently live in?

____ Single family dwelling
____ Apartment in single family
____ Basement apartment
____ Apartment in building with 4 floors or less
____ Apartment in building with more than 4 floors
____ Townhouse (Attached, Rowhousing)

____ Duplex
____ Rooms
____ Shared apartment
____ Shared house
____ Other (specify)

How many rooms do you presently live in excluding the bathroom?
____

How many bedrooms do you presently have? ___

Are these adequate? Yes___ No___

Do you have separate kitchen/dining room? Yes___ No___

Do you have separate living room or is it combined with another room? ____

Do you have adequate storage/closet space in your home?
Yes___ No___

Do you have storage space elsewhere in the building? Yes___ No__

Do you feel secure about storing things elsewhere in your building? Yes___ No___

Are you bothered by any household pests such as cockroaches, mice, earwigs etc.? Yes___ No___

Do you have access to reliable pest control when you need it?
Yes___ No___

Are the locks on your apartment/room doors secure? Yes___ No___

Do you feel that the building you live in is secure? Yes___ No___

If not, why? ____
____

Do you know any of your immediate neighbours (i.e. next door, across the hall, downstairs, etc.)? Yes___ No___

Do you participate in any programs such as neighbourhood watch, building watch etc.? Yes___ No___

If no, would you participate in a voluntary neighbourhood watch program? Yes___ No___

How would you arrrange the space in your apartment if you had the same amount of space you have now? Would you want the bedrooms smaller but more of them or a larger kitchen and smaller living room?____

Rank order the following:

Smaller bedrooms, larger living room________
Larger kitchen, smaller living room______
Larger kitchen, smaller bedroom_________
Larger bedroom, smaller living room_______
Extra bathroom, smaller other rooms_______
Shower and sink separate from toilet______
Smaller bedrooms, but more of them_______

Are you satisfied with your present living arrangements?
Yes___ No___

Did your housing needs change at all as your child(ren) got older? If so, how?____

What is the one thing you like most about your home?____________
___________________________Anything else?______________________

What is the one thing you like least about your home?__________
___________________________Anything else?

Is the apartment _____too warm
_____too cold

How did you cope during last summer's heat wave?_____________

Can you think of anything else about your housing situation that gives you problems or that you would like to change?___________

Do you feel that your children have suffered at all because of your housing situation? (problems with school, health, law, etc.)

Is there anything else you would like to add that I may not have covered?____

Do you know of any other single mothers who might be interested in talking to me about their housing situation?_______________

Would you like to receive a summary of this research when the project is finished? (if Yes, have the interviewee fill out a separate sheet)

BE SURE TO THANK MOTHER FOR PARTICIPATION AND OBTAIN RECEIPT

* *

Yes, please send me a copy of your research summary when it is available.

Name:________________________________

Address______________________________

____

Postal Code__________________________

* *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burden, D. S. (1986). Single parents and the work setting: The impact of multiple job and homelife responsibilities. Family Relations, 35, 37-43.

Campbell, F. A., Breitmayer, B. & Ramey, C. T. (1986). Disadvantaged single teenage mothers and their children: Consequences of educational daycare. Family Relations, 35, 63-68.

Canadian Council on Social Development. (1971). The One-parent family. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development.

Denton, M. A. & Davis, C. K. (1987). Patterns of support: The use of support services among public housing tenants in Ontario. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

France, I. (1985). Hubertusvereniging: A transition point for single parents. Women and Environments, 7 (4), 20-22.

Guyatt, D. E. (1971). The one-parent family in Canada. Ottawa: The Vanier Institute of the Family.

Heft, H. & Wohlwill, J. F. (1987). Environmental cognition in children. In D. Stokols and I. Altman (Eds.), Handbook of environmental psychology, Vol. 1. New York: Wiley.

Johnson, L. C. (1987). The developmental implications of home environments. In C. S. Weinstein and T. G. David (Eds.),Spaces for children: The built environment and child development. New York: Plenum.

Klodawsky, F. & Spector, A. (1986). Housing policy as implicit family policy: the case of mother-led families. Transition, 6-8.

Klodawsky, F. & Spector, A. (1985). Mother-led families and the built environment in Canada. Women and Environments, 7 (2), 12-17.

Klodawsky, F., Spector, A. & Damaris, R. (1985). Single Parent Families and Canadian Housing Policies: How Mothers Lose. Ottawa: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Leavitt, J. (1984). The shelter plus issue for single parents. Women and Environments, 6 (2), 16-20.

Li, S. (1978). Project Child Care Working Paper #4: Options for Single Mothers. University of Toronto: Project Child Care and Faculty of Social Work.

Lindsley, O. R. (1966). Geriatric behavior prosthetics. In R. Ulrich, T. Stachnik and J. Mabry (Eds.), Control of human behavior. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co.

McLanahan, S. S. (1985). Single mothers and psychological well-being: A test of the stress and vulnerability hypothesis. Research in Community and Mental Health, 5, 253-266.

McMillan, S. (1987). Forty years of social housing in Toronto. Canadian Social Trends. (Winter), 24-30. Statistics Canada.

Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1986). Ontario Child Health Study: Summary of Initial Findings. Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Moore, G. T. (1987). The physical environment and cognitive development in child-care centers. In C. S. Weinstein and T. G. David (Eds.), Spaces for children: The built environment and child development. New York: Plenum.

Moore, M. (1987). Women parenting alone. Canadian Social Trends. (Winter), 31-36. Statistics Canada.

Mueller, D. P. & Cooper, P. W. (1986). Children of single parent families: How they fare as young adults. Family Relations, 35, 169-176.

Newman, O. (1972). Defensible Space. New York: Macmillan.

Offord, D. R. & Boyle, M. H. (1986). Morbidity Among Welfare Children in Ontario. Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Olds, A. R. (1987). Designing settings for infants and toddlers. In C. S. Weinstein and T. G. David (Eds.), Spaces for children: The built environment and child development. New York: Plenum.

Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues. (1987). Brief to the Ontario Government on Sole Support Mothers. Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues.

Parliamentary Special Committee on Child Care. (1987). Sharing the Responsibility. Ottawa: House of Commons.

Prescott, E. (1987). The environment as organizer of intent in child-care settings. In C. S. Weinstein and T. G. David (Eds.), Spaces for children: The built environment and child development. New York: Plenum.

Pool, I. & Moore, M. (1986). Lone Parenthood: Characteristics and Determinants. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Saegert, S. (1982). Environment and children's mental health: Residential density and low income children. In A. Baum and J. E. Singer (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology and health: Issues in child health and adolescent health*, *2*, 247-271. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Sanik, M. M. & Maudlin, T. (1986). Single versus two parent families: A comparison of mother's time. *Family Relations*, *35*, 53-56.

Sommer, R. (1972). *Design awareness*. San Francisco: Rinehart Press.

Sommer, R. (1974). *Tight spaces: Hard architecture and how to humanize it*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Soper, M. (1980). Housing for single-parent families: A women's design. In G. Wekerle, R. Peterson, and D. Morley, (Eds.) *New space for women*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Statistics Canada. (1984). *Canada's lone parent families*. 1981 Census of Canada, Census Content Series. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Turner, P. H. & Smith, R. M. (1983). Single parents and daycare. *Family Relations*, *32*, 215-226.

Unger, D. G. & Wandersman, L. P. (1985). Social support and adolescent mothers: Action research contributions to theory and application. *Journal of Social Issues*, *41*, 29-45.

Wachs, T. D. (1987). Developmental perspectives on designing for development. In C. S. Weinstein and T. G. David (Eds.), *Spaces for children: The built environment and child development*. New York: Plenum.

Weinstein, C. S. & David, T. G. (1987). *Spaces for children: The built environment and child development*. New York: Plenum.

Weizmann, F., Friendly, M. and Gonda G. (1985). *The Montrose Project: A comparative evaluation of a day care centre for the children of adolescent mothers*. Queens Park, Ontario: Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Zeisel, J. (1981). *Inquiry by design: Tools for environment-behavior research*. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.